IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND

CRIMINAL ACTION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA 13-0438

VS. FEBRUARY 10, 2014

GERALD SILVA * * * * PROVIDENCE, RI

HEARD BEFORE THE HONORABLE WILLIAM E. SMITH

CHIEF JUDGE

(Jury Trial)

VOLUME III

REDACTED

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE GOVERNMENT: TERRENCE P. DONNELLY, AUSA

U.S. Attorney's Office

50 Kennedy Plaza

Providence, RI 02903

ROBERT B. MANN, ESQ. Mann & Mitchell FOR THE DEFENDANT:

One Turks Head Place

Suite 610

Providence, RI 02903

Court Reporter: Anne M. Clayton, RPR

> One Exchange Terrace Providence, RI 02903

Proceeding reported and produced by computer-aided stenography

<u>PAGE</u>

Ι	Ν	D	Ε	Χ	

<u>WITNESS</u>

GERALD SILVA

Continuation of Direct Examination	
by Mr. Mann:	3
Cross-Examination by Mr. Donnelly:	88
Redirect Examination by Mr. Mann:	143

<u>DEFENDANT'S EXHIBITS</u>	<u>ID</u>	<u>FULL</u>
D -	68	69

10 FEBRUARY 2014 -- 9:20 A.M.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

(Proceedings in the presence of the jury as follows:)

THE COURT: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen, and welcome back. I hope you had an enjoyable weekend. Sorry for the delay in getting started this morning. I had a few things I needed to take up with counsel and hopefully will make the remaining part of the trial go more smoothly. So I think we're ready to go forward with Mr. Mann's continued examination of his client, Mr. Silva.

Are you ready to go forward, Mr. Mann?

MR. MANN: Yes, I am, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Let's get Mr. Silva back on the witness stand.

GERALD SILVA, Resumes stand.

THE COURT: You've already been sworn.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Go ahead, Mr. Mann.

MR. MANN: Thank you, your Honor.

CONTINUATION OF DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. MANN

- Q. Mr. Silva, can you tell us how old you are?
- A. Fifty-nine years old.
- **Q**. Where were you born, sir?
- 25 A. Providence, Rhode Island.

- 2 A. East Providence, Rhode Island.
- \mathbf{Q} . With whom?
- A. My biological parents, my maternal grandparentsand my siblings.
- Q. Can you describe generally the livingarrangements.
- A. I lived upstairs with my mother, my father and my siblings, and my maternal grandparents lived downstairs.
- 11 **Q**. What did your mother and father do?
- A. My mother was a homemaker, and my father worked for Bird and Son as a boiler operator.
- 14 Q. Where did you go to school?
- 15 A. Sacred Hearts School and LaSalle Academy.
- 16 Q. When did you graduate from high school?
- 17 **A**. 1972.
- 18 **Q**. After high school, did you go to college?
- 19 A. Yes, I did.
- 20 **Q**. Where?
- A. I went to Providence College for one year pre-med, and then I went to Johnson & Wales Business College.
- Q. And how long did you go to Johnson & Wales?
- A. Four years.
- 25 Q. Did you get any degrees from Johnson & Wales?

- 1 A. Yes, I did.
- 2 **Q**. What degrees?
- A. I got a baccalaureate in Business Management and associate in Business Management and associate in Business Administration.
- Q. How did it come to be that you obtained three degrees, sir?
- A. I got a second associate's when you have optionsto take other courses, instead of taking liberal arts,
- I took general sciences course which rendered me asecond degree.
- 12 Q. When did you get your BS in Business Management?
- 13 **A**. 1977.
- 14 Q. Did you get any post-graduate degrees, sir?
- 15 A. Yes, I did.
- 16 **Q**. When?
- 17 A. I got an MSW in 1994.
- 18 **Q**. And --
- 19 A. That's a master's in Social Work.
- \mathbf{Q} . What was that a master's in?
- 21 A. Master's in Social Work.
- 22 **Q**. Where did you get that degree from?
- A. Rhode Island College.
- Q. And you said you got it from 1990 to 1994, why did
- 25 it take four years?

- 1 A. I did it part-time while I was working.
- Q. Did you obtain any professional credentials?
- A. I have a state license. It's called LICSW, which
 is Licensed Individual Clinical Social Worker. I also
- 5 have an ACSW, which is Accredited Clinical Social
- 6 Worker through the NASW.
- 7 **Q**. What is the NASW?
 - A. National Association of Social Workers.
 - **Q**. Are these certifications current, sir?
- 10 A. The ACSW is, but the LICSW is not because you have
- 11 to use a computer to renew it and right now I have no
- 12 access to a computer.
- 13 Q. Can you describe generally your childhood.
- 14 A. Yes. I grew up, as I mentioned, with my parents.
- They never divorced. I lived in the same house. I was
- in the Boy Scouts, Little League, Columbus Squires,
- 17 different organizations like that.
- 18 Q. Are both your parents still alive?
- 19 A. My father passed away in 1996. My mom is still
- 20 alive.

- 21 \ Q. Are you still close with her?
- 22 **A**. Yes, I am.
- 23 Q. Now, you said you engaged in some activities as a
- child including Little League, Columbus Squires and Boy
- 25 | Scouts. What is Columbus Squires?

- A. Columbus Squires is a youth group organization run
 by the Knights of Columbus as kind of a junior program.
 It was an activity-based program.
 - Q. And did you have any positions in that program?
 - A. I was the Chief Columbus Squire for the council in East Providence, and I was the state Chief Columbus Squire for the State of Rhode Island.
 - Q. What did it mean to be the state chief squire?
 - A. You coordinate with all the different councils' activities, the different Columbus Squire programs in the different councils throughout the state.
- Q. You said you were involved with the Boy Scouts.

 When did you start out with the Scouts?
- 14 A. As a Cub Scout.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

15

16

20

21

- Q. What was the highest rank you attained?
- A. Eagle scout with a gold palm.
- 17 Q. What does the "gold palm" mean?
- A. Beyond rank of eagle scout, there was additional badges I earned, merit badges to get the gold palm.
 - **Q**. As a Boy Scout, were you associated with a particular troop?
 - **A**. Troop 29 in East Providence.
- Q. After you graduated from high school, did you continue your involvement with scouting?
- 25 A. Yes, I did.

Q. How did that happen?

1

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

- 2 The scout leader had left. There was no one to Α. 3 replace him, and so I took over the troop. One of the 4 fathers of one the former scouts signed up as scout 5 leader and -- because he couldn't do it either and so I took over the scout troop when I was 18.
 - Q. Now, were you able to formally be the scout master when you were 18?
 - Α. No. You can't be scout master at 18. You have to be 21. So I signed up as the assistant scout master.
 - Q. And as the assistant scout master, did you effectively run the troop anyway?
- 13 Α. Yes, I did. I ran the troop.
 - Q. How did that come to be?
- 15 Α. Say again?
- 16 Q. How was it you were able to run the troop? What 17 happened to the scout master?
- 18 Α. There wasn't anybody available for a scout master. 19 So one of the former scout's father signed the papers 20 as a scout leader and let me run the troop.
 - Q. About how long did you run the troop?
- 22 Α. About ten years.
- 23 Q. When you were 21, did something change?
- 24 Α. I was able to sign up as scout master.
- 25 Q. During that ten-year period when you were running

the troop, did you also hold positions with any other scout troops?

A. Yes. I briefly held position as scout master for Troop 6, New Haven Methodist Church. They had lost their scout leader. They asked me to take over the troop for a while until they could locate a new scout master. They weren't able to do that so we folded their troop into mine.

And I also held a position as a committee chairperson for Troop 63 Rehoboth. It was like a brother unit to us. We used to travel with them and do different things with that troop.

- **Q**. The troop from Haven Methodist Church, did that actually merge with your troop?
- A. Yes. They couldn't find a scout leader so whatever boys wanted to stay in scouting they had the opportunity to come in as part of our troop.
- **Q**. During the ten years that you were scout master, can you describe some of the activities that your troop did?
- MR. DONNELLY: Your Honor, I think I'd just object to the relevance at this point. I don't mind some background but --

THE COURT: Overruled.

A. We actually went to Bermuda. We had our own bus.

- 1 Went to national jamborees. Traveled to Washington,
- 2 D.C., various places like that. We had an Indian dance
- 3 team, a rifle team, a rifle drill team. It was a very
- 4 active scout troop.
 - Q. Why did you stop being the scout leader after ten
- 6 years?

- A. I got a job with the Eckert Foundation.
- Q. Do you know what happened with your troop after you left?
- 10 A. About a year later it folded.
- 11 **Q**. It what?
- 12 A. It ended about a year after I left.
- 13 Q. You said you got a job with the Eckert Foundation.
- 14 What was the Eckert Foundation?
- 15 A. The Eckert Foundation was an organization for
- 16 troubled youth. It was primarily boys at that time.
- 17 It was established by Mr. and Mrs. Eckert. They had
- 18 run the Eckert chain down in Florida. They sold their
- 19 chain. They had a lot of money. They wanted to do
- 20 something good for the community so they started a
- 21 residential wilderness treatment program for troubled
- 22 youth.
- 23 Q. And what was the population that they addressed?
- A. The population at the time was all male ranging in
- age from roughly 12 to up to 18 years of age.

THE COURT: Put the mike a little closer to you. 1 2 THE DEFENDANT: I'm sorry, your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Thank you. 4 Q. How old were you when you started with the Eckert 5 Foundation? Α. 6 About 28. 7 Prior to working at Eckert, had you had previous Q. 8 work experience? 9 Α. I worked at a New York System and Sear's 10 Department Stores. 11 Q. What was your first position at Eckert? 12 As a counselor. Α. 13 Q. Was there a screening process prior to being 14 hired? 15 Yes, there was. Α. 16 Q. Can you just briefly summarize it. 17 MR. DONNELLY: I object to this, your Honor. 18 THE COURT: Come up. 19 (Sidebar conference.) All right. What's the substance of 20 THE COURT: 21 this going to be? 22 MR. MANN: That there was a screening process 23 and first there were interviews in Rhode Island and 24 then there was a second part of the process where he 25 gets interviewed by psychologists and psychiatrists and

others and then after he was hired there was training.

What I'm going to eventually argue to this jury, I hope, is that this is a man that's had 39 years of experience, and if you include the scouting experience in this, which -- difficult population, starting the populations. I already almost provided the populations. But he's been in the system for a long time and that that's a factor that should be considered in assessing who he is and I think this is just part of the background.

I think it's probably pretty obvious that anybody that gets hired as a counselor at any of these facilities or programs gets interviewed, goes through a vetting process of some sort.

MR. DONNELLY: I think the objection at this point is to the fact that the question is calling for the witness to bootstrap hearsay into the record; namely, people in Florida and the proof that Bob just made. I'm not going to object if he wants to go through his various professional roles with boys, but I think just trying to get into what other people thought or said it's hearsay.

THE COURT: Only if it's being admitted for its truth. And I guess --

MR. DONNELLY: I don't see any other purpose.

1 MR. MANN: I'm not going to ask him what those 2 people said. 3 THE COURT: Or what they concluded? 4 MR. MANN: No. I'm going to ask him did you go 5 through a screening process, what did the process 6 consist of. And one way or the other I'm going to end 7 up arguing at the end of this case that he interviewed 8 for jobs that involved dealing with either youths or 9 finally adults when he was a probation officer and that 10 by definition that it's --11 THE COURT: I'm going to allow it. You can deal 12 with it on cross-examination. 13 (End of sidebar conference.) 14 THE COURT: All right. The objection is 15 overruled. 16 Do you remember the last question? 17 THE DEFENDANT: I'd like to have it repeated, 18 please. 19 THE COURT: All right. Go ahead. 20 (Pending question read by the reporter.) 21 Α. Yes, there's an interview process here up in Rhode 22 Once you passed -- you went through that

interview process, you spent a few days at the camp to

be observed. Then I went down to Florida. In Florida

there's like a three-day evaluation with various

23

24

- interviews, including psychologists, psychiatrists,social workers and so on.
 - Q. After -- I'm sorry. Have you completed --
 - A. After you went down to Florida. After I was interviewed in Rhode Island, I went down to Florida for a screening down there.
 - **Q**. And were you hired?
 - A. Yes, I was.

- Q. And after you were hired, was there training?
- 10 A. Yes, there was.
 - **Q**. What was the training?
 - A. The initial training was there's a six-week program where you went down, you were still down in Florida, and you lived as -- the class were called campers. And we lived as a camper, we lived as the client. We lived in the program to get an understanding of what life was like. And two senior counselors came in from other camps to be the adults, so to speak, and the instructors. So there was a six-week training period.
 - MR. MANN: Mr. Silva, could I ask you to speak more into the microphone because at one point --

THE DEFENDANT: Yes. Sorry about that.

Q. Now, after the training program, did you return to Rhode Island?

A. Yes, I did.

1

4

5

6

9

10

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- Q. And what did you do when you returned to Rhode Island?
 - A. I went to help supervise a group of ten boys as a counselor with another counselor.
 - **Q**. Can you describe the work conditions.
- A. It was a therapeutic wilderness program and you worked 5 days a week, 24 hours a day with 2 days off.
 - **Q**. Where did this work actually physically take place?
 - A. It was in Exeter, Rhode Island.
- 12 **Q**. Was it a particular -- can you describe the environment?
 - A. It was a therapeutic wilderness environment where the boys lived in semi-permanent tents.
 - **Q**. Were there times when the work schedule was different than the five days on, two days off?
 - A. Periodically, we would take trips down to like Florida, Georgia, places like that. We'd take canoe trips on the Suwannee River or take hiking trips up in the mountains and that would require me to work six weeks at a time.
 - Q. Were you working full-time during those six weeks?
- A. Twenty-four-hour days, six, seven days a week, six weeks.

- Q. When you were doing this kind of work and living at the camp, where were you living?
 - A. In a semi-permanent tent with the group at a camp site.
 - **Q**. How long were you a counselor?
- 6 A. As a counselor, about six months.
- 7 **Q**. What happened after that?
 - A. I became a senior counselor.
 - **Q**. What was the job of the senior counselor?
- A. The senior counselor was the person most
 responsible for the group and for the training of the
 more junior counselor, the continued training of.
- 13 Q. How big was the group?
- 14 A. Ten boys.

3

4

5

8

9

- **Q**. How long were you senior counselor?
- 16 A. About a year.
- 17 **Q**. What happened after that?
- 18 A. I became a group work supervisor.
- 19 **Q**. What was that position?
- A. It was supervising the senior counselors and the regular counselors to make sure that the program was being implemented properly in the program.
- Q. How long were you a group work counselor?
- A. About a year or two.
- 25 Q. What was your next position?

- A. Program specialist.
- $2 \mid \mathbf{Q}$. What was that job?

8

9

- 3 A. To coordinate -- to develop and coordinate the
- 4 program between the group works supervisor and the
- 5 program director to make sure the program was
- 6 therapeutic and being implemented appropriately.
- 7 Q. How long were you in that position?
 - A. It was about a year or two there, too.
 - Q. Did you move then to another position?
- 10 A. I moved into the position of program director.
- 11 **Q**. Where were you a program director?
- 12 A. In New Hampshire.
- Q. Was that still part of the same Eckert Foundation setup?
- 15 A. Yes, it was.
 - Q. Why did you move to New Hampshire?
- 17 A. They were starting a new program there from
- 18 scratch. There was no program in New Hampshire. There
- 19 was just land. So I went up with the resident director
- to develop the program, develop the staff.
- 21 **Q**. How long did you stay in New Hampshire?
- 22 A. Two years.
- 23 Q. Tell us briefly what your duties were in New
- Hampshire.
- 25 A. As program director, I was second-in-charge of the

- overall program, and to get -- ensure the program was safe and secure for the kids and that it was being properly administered through the program specialist and the group work supervisor, the counselors, and we also had educational staff there as well.
- Q. Did you move from that position after about two years?
 - A. Yes. I returned to Rhode Island as camp director.
 - Q. Where was that, Camp E Huntee?
 - A. Camp E Huntee, yep.
- 11 **Q**. And what was the job as the camp director at Camp 12 E Huntee?
- A. The senior-most person responsible for the operation of the program. I oversaw the staff of about 33 people and 56 clients.
 - Q. How long did you remain at Camp E Huntee as a director?
- 18 A. Two years.

1

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

16

17

- 19 **Q**. You left after about two years as director?
- 20 A. Yeah, after about two years.
- 21 **Q**. Why did you leave Eckert?
- 22 A. I had lost confidence in the program.
 - **Q**. Can you explain what you mean.
- A. Seemed to become more about the money than about the program itself. We were paid on a per diem basis,

- 1 which means that if a child is in a bed, we get paid.
- 2 If the bed is empty, we don't get paid; and it was
- 3 getting to the point where the referrals weren't what
- 4 they should be, and I was under a lot of pressure to
- 5 bring kids into the program that I didn't think were
- 6 safe for the rest of the population of the camp.
- 7 Q. How old were you when you left Camp E Huntee?
 - **A**. About 35.

8

- **Q**. Where did you go from Camp E Huntee?
- 10 A. I went to Kent County Mental Health Center.
- 11 Q. What is Kent County Mental Health Center?
- 12 A. It's located in Warwick, Rhode Island.
- 13 **Q**. What is it?
- A. What is it? It's a community-based mental health center that deals with families that have difficulties,
- 16 especially mental health issues, behavioral issues.
- 17 **Q**. What was your job?
- 18 A. My job was a case manager.
- 19 **Q**. What were your duties there as a case manager?
- 20 A. To work with adolescent males primarily, who were
- 21 having difficulty in home and school and community.
- 22 **Q**. Did you focus on a subpopulation of adolescent
- 23 males?
- 24 A. They were usually aggressive adolescent males.
- \mathbf{Q} . Can you tell us what you actually did in this

position.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

- A. Basically, my job was to bring the boys out, give them some activities in the community, whether go to the mall, back then they had arcades. We'd go to the arcades. Someplace where they could relax and talk at the same time about their particular issues. And I'd also work with the clinician. A clinician is a licensed therapist who dealt with the parents and the family as a whole.
- **Q**. How long did you hold this job?
- 11 A. For about four or five years roughly.
- Q. While you were holding this job, were you also going to school?
- 14 A. Yes, I was.
 - Q. Where was that?
- 16 A. That was at Rhode Island College for my master's 17 in Social Work.
- 18 **Q**. Were you going to school part-time?
- 19 **A**. Yes.
- Q. When you graduated -- when did you graduate from Rhode Island College?
- 22 **A**. 1994.
- Q. At some point after you received your degree from Rhode Island College, did you begin to look for alternative work?

A. Yes, I did.

- **Q**. Why was that?
- A. I had my license. I was looking for better payand different working conditions.
 - **Q**. Did you get an offer to work shortly after you received your master's from another program?
 - A. Yes. I was hired by Gateway Mental Health Center, which is located in Johnston, Rhode Island. Same type of program as Kent County Mental Health Center.
 - **Q**. What was your position at Gateway?
 - A. As a clinician. With my master's degree, I was able to do therapy for the family as well as for the youth, for the parents as well.
 - **Q**. Did you specialize in a certain population there?
 - A. I dealt with -- at that time, I also brought on adolescent females so adolescent females and adolescent males was my primary caseload. And again, I specialized in aggressive adolescent males.
 - **Q**. At some point, did you assume greater responsibilities at Gateway?
 - A. Yes. I became a team leader.
- **Q**. What is a team leader?
 - A. A team leader works with other clinicians to coordinate meetings and information and to be a resource for other clinicians and case managers.

- Q. And did you also have responsibility for
 supervising meetings with other people?
 - A. With other clinicians and case managers, yes.
 - **Q**. How long were you at Gateway?
- 5 A. Until about 2004.
- 6 **Q**. About eight-and-a-half years?
- 7 A. Roughly, yes.
- 8 Q. And why did you leave?
 - A. I got a job as a probation officer.
- 10 **Q**. And was that with Rhode Island?
- 11 A. Rhode Island.
- 12 **Q**. How did you get to become a probation officer?
- A. Basically, I took an examination, passed the examination, and then went through an interview
- 15 process.

4

- 16 **Q**. What did that process cover?
- 17 A. It covered my experience, my credentials, things
- 18 like that, and as well as the openings that were
- 19 available at the Department of Corrections.
- 20 Q. And did you learn what types of openings were
- 21 available?
- 22 A. Yes, I did.
- 23 Q. What types of openings were available?
- 24 A. There were two primary positions open. One was
- 25 for what they call a generic caseload. Generic

- caseloads have about 430 people on them at that time.

 And then they had the opening in the Sex Offender Unit.
- 3 which had a maximum of 70 probationers per caseload.
 - **Q**. And when you learned that those were the two positions that were available, what was your reaction?
- 6 A. Well, I didn't know what they could do with 430
- 7 people on your caseload, and their response was that,
- 8 well, you take the top 25 and do the best you can. I
- 9 didn't see that as being productive and so I settled
- 10 for the sex offender caseload.
- 11 **Q**. And at some point, were you notified that you
- 12 would be offered a position?
- 13 A. Yes, sir, I was.

- 14 Q. How did that happen?
- 15 A. I received a phone call from an administrator at
- 16 the Department of Corrections. They said that they
- wanted to hire me for the sex offender caseload.
- 18 **Q**. What was your response?
- A. I told them I needed -- I'd like to have a couple of days to think about it.
- 21 **Q**. And how did that all work out?
- Δ . They said they needed an immediate answer, but I
- said I couldn't give an immediate answer so they gave
- 24 me a day.
- 25 **Q**. And then what happened?

- A. The next day I called them and said I would take the position, but they wanted me to start immediately. And I told them I couldn't start immediately because I had obligations to Gateway. I had clients and I had staff that I was supervising, that I would need two weeks notice for Gateway.
- **Q**. Did they work out a solution to allow you to do that?
- A. They worked out a solution that the Department of Human Resources at the DOC, they hired me, they put me on a two-week leave and then I was able to transition from Gateway effectively to the Department of Corrections.
- **Q**. So you then became a probation officer for sex offenders?
- A. Sex offender caseload, yeah.

- Q. Can you explain -- and about when was that, sir?
- A. Around April 2004. April 19th, 2004 was the hire date, but then it was two weeks later that I actually started.
 - **Q**. Can you explain what training you had for that position.
- A. They call it NEO training, new employee orientation. And they went through all the procedures for the Department of Corrections but what they hired

- me for because I had a lot of previous training on sex offenders, plus I had worked with sex offenders and their victims as well in the past.
- **Q**. You said you worked with sex offenders. Can you explain that?
- A. When I was working with a lot of the aggressive adolescent males, some of them had been sexually abused so they were victims, obviously. Some of those who were victims reacted -- what they call reacted, they had sex with someone else and they became offenders.
- **Q**. Did you have training to deal with both children who had been sexually abused and those who were reactive to their abuse?
- A. Yes. Starting even at Eckert Foundation right up through there were various training sessions from various organizations on how to deal with their trauma.
- **Q**. Have you had any training, either before or after you became a probation officer dealing with child pornography?
- A. When I was at Kent County, starting with Kent County and moving forward, I had training regarding child pornography including two sessions with the FBI -- well, with an FBI agent. One was conducted at the Newport Naval Base, sponsored by the NCIS, which is Naval Criminal Investigative Services, that actually

- showed child pornography and then a second one by the same FBI agent at a different location. But there were
- 3 multiple trainings throughout my career at various
- 4 agencies.
- 5 **Q.** Now, are you still a probation officer?
- A. Yes, I am, but I'm on administrative leave untilthis situation gets corrected.
- Q. You've been on administrative leave basically since this case started?
- 10 A. Correct.
- 11 Q. Did you spend your entire career working as a
- 12 probation officer working with the sex offender
- 13 caseload?
- 14 A. Yes, I did.
- Q. And were you a probation officer on the day of vour arrest?
- 17 | **A**. Yes, I was.
- 18 Q. Do you remember what that day was?
- 19 A. September 27, 2012.
- 20 Q. Now, you know Ken Bell, don't you?
- 21 A. I sure do, yes.
- Q. You recognized him as one of the witnesses who testified, right?
- 24 A. Yes, I did.
- 25 **Q**. And did you know what his job was before his

1 current job?

5

6

7

10

- A. He was head of the ICAC unit at the State Police

 Office. The ICAC being the Internet Crimes Against

 Children Unit.
 - **Q**. And did you know him professionally over the years?
 - A. Say again?
- Q. Did you know then Sergeant Bell professionally over the years?
 - A. Yes, I did.
- 11 \mathbf{Q} . In May of 2012, did you send him an e-mail?
- 12 A. Yes, I did.
- MR. MANN: Could I have I think 29, 30 and 31.
- Q. Now, was this the first e-mail, showing you

 Exhibit 29, that you sent to Mr. Bell, Sergeant Bell
 then?
- 17 **A.** Yes, it is.
- Q. And when you sent this e-mail, were you concerned that you wouldn't send information to an incorrect address?
 - A. Yes, I was.
- Q. Why was that?
- A. I had some information I believed that was
 relevant to his job, so to speak, and I wanted to make
 sure that it didn't go to anybody but him.

- Q. And where did you send this e-mail from, what e-mail address?
- 3 A. From my office at the Department of Corrections.
- 4 Q. It has your name on it?
- 5 A. Yes, it does, at the top.
- Q. And you received a response to that e-mail; is that correct?
- 8 A. Yes, I did.
- 9 **Q**. And is this the response that you received?
- 10 **A**. Yes, it is.
- 11 **Q**. And you know that the heading is on the previous page, right?
- 13 **A**. Yes.
- 14 **Q**. And after you received this e-mail, did you send 15 Sergeant Bell another e-mail?
- 16 A. Yes, I did.
- 17 **Q**. And this is the second e-mail that you sent 18 Sergeant Bell?
- 19 A. That is correct.
- Q. What prompted you to send this e-mail to Sergeant Bell?
- MR. DONNELLY: For the record, are we talking about 30?
- MR. MANN: We're talking -- pardon me?
- MR. DONNELLY: We're on Exhibit 30 now?

MR. MANN: Yes. Let me rephrase the question.

- **Q**. Exhibit 29 was sent on May 11th, wasn't it, the very first e-mail?
- A. The very first one, correct.
- Q. This e-mail was sent on the next day, right?
- A. Correct.

- Q. What prompted you to send these e-mails?
- A. I'd been following a website called Azov or actually been on the website called Azov, which we're all very familiar with now. And to me, it was just fine. No problem, naturist website. But then they had moved into a link that led them into an adult porn site called Boy Joy. And I became very irritated by that because naturist websites do not link into pornography. There's no link between naturism and pornography. And in one of the statements from the Boy Joy website was that some of the boys, not all but some of the boys that were in the adult pornography site had been previously in the Azov movies.

And I became irritated by that. I was concerned that if they're moving from naturist, perfectly fine, naturist movies into the adult pornography that they would then lapse into probably, maybe possibly grooming these kids to be in something -- well, into the adult pornography or maybe even into child pornography, which

I was very concerned about.

I lost my signal to the Azov and to the Boy Joy one. I wasn't able to monitor it. I didn't want to buy the Internet. I don't have the Internet. And I felt that there was something that somebody needed to be monitoring this site in case they did cross the line.

- **Q**. Now, when you were arrested, did you volunteer to Mr. Connelly that you had communicated --
- A. At some point he said to me, Did you tell anybody about the Azov site. And my response was I had sent an e-mail to Sergeant Bell. I said it was after the fact of having lost the site, which now we understand was closed down. And then I said, So I don't think it really mattered.
- **Q**. Now, when you sent this e-mail, did you know the Azov site had been closed down?
- A. I didn't know it was closed down. I thought I had lost my -- I did lose my wi-fi signal for all things, and I wasn't able to get back onto it.
- **Q**. At some point, did you suspect the Azov site had been shut down?
- A. Yes. Sometime later I got a wi-fi signal and went back and there was a thing saying that it was unavailable or something, something or other. And I

- thought it was maybe shut down at that time.
 - **Q**. Later you sent the third e-mail?
 - A. Right. That's when I sent the third e-mail.
 - **Q**. So in terms of timing, you tried to get the Azov website after you sent this e-mail but before the third e-mail?
 - A. That is correct.

- **Q**. And then after you tried to access the site and you couldn't, did you have suspicions about what had happened?
- A. I thought that maybe my suspicions were correct, that behind the scenes -- there's nothing obviously in either one of the films. They were both legitimate, the Azov and the Boy Joy ones were -- they were legal, but I was concerned that something was happening behind the scenes. And if something was happening behind the scenes, then I was hopeful that somebody had caught up with these guys and had done something about it.
- **Q**. Now, I want to direct your attention to certain specific parts of this e-mail that's on the screen, okay?
- 22 A. Correct. Sure.
- 23 Q. You talk about discovering a website called Azov?
- 24 A. Correct.
- 25 Q. How did you discover Azov?

- A. I had been perusing the Internet looking for different DVDs, and they were linked in through Amazon. I Googled it. Googled Amazon. Amazon linked me into Azov.
- **Q**. Then you say, "The only naturist films they have are of nude boys," do you see that?
- A. Right.

- Q. Why did you say that?
- A. Just above it I put down in parentheses -- not parentheses, but I put down that they were European naturist website, quote, unquote, because I was concerned, again, that they had gone from being a pure naturist website into adult pornography and that doesn't happen in naturist sites. That caused me to reassess what is the real purpose of having boys -- it was fine until that point, but once you get into adult pornography, then it raises a different question about what the purpose of these boys are.

So I was concerned then at that point in time that they were focusing on boys and maybe they were grooming them for the purpose of getting them into adult pornography later on.

Q. Then you say, "I suspect that they do this to provide an air of legitimacy." What did you mean by that?

- A. Right. So in other words is that they're using Azov, which is the naturist films, and they were using the commercial films to give a sense of respectability to the adult pornography site.
- **Q**. At the end of that paragraph you say that, "None of them appear to cross the line into pornography, though I think they definitely flirt with the line." What did you mean by that?
- A. Right. The Boy Joy one was the "Barely Legal 18."

 It's now just as soon as these kids turned 18, it seems

 -- I'm making assumptions on that. As soon as they

 turn 18, then they lapsed into the adult pornography,

 and it's like they're flirting with the line there.

Again, the concern was that if they go into the adult pornography, these kids are in line with being groomed for the adult pornography. In that grooming process, might they cut that grooming process short and then get into child pornography. I didn't want that to happen.

- **Q**. Then you say in the next paragraph that you believe they will cross the line at some point if they haven't already. Do you see that? What did you mean by that?
- A. Right. Again, behind the scenes. Again, there's nothing visible. Both sites, even the Boy Joy one was

absolutely legal. I want to emphasize that because I don't want to get into any problems with that. They were both legal sites. The fact that they linked together a naturist site and an adult site is that if they had crossed the line there was nothing visual in the films themselves but what might be happening in real life behind the scenes when you're not seeing these particular films.

- **Q**. You refer to Boy Joy and you refer to it in this e-mail here, right?
- A. Um-hum. Yes.

- **Q**. And what was Boy Joy?
- A. Boy Joy was the name of the barely legal adult pornography site.
 - Q. Could you link to that from the Azov website?
 - A. Yes. That's what sort of irritated me. If they had put that site separate somewhere and hadn't linked it into the Azov, I wouldn't have probably even known about it.
 - **Q**. Then you say that you suspect, but you don't have any evidence, that the boys featured in the naturist films are being groomed. I think that's down here.
 - A. Correct. Yeah.
 - Q. Is that the same stuff you had been talking about?
 - A. Yeah. Exactly the same stuff. They were

1 conditioning them to become adult actors.

- **Q**. At the end of this communication, you say that you have a really bad feeling about what may be happening to these boys?
- A. Correct.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- **Q**. What did you mean by that?
- Α. It's the same thing that I said earlier. There's never a link between naturism and an adult pornography It just doesn't happen. I've never seen it. I've gone to every naturist site in the world, but it just doesn't happen. And my concern was I didn't know what to do about it. Now, I lost my signal. going to get the Internet. I couldn't follow these folks. The best person and the person I trust most in life when it comes to these things was Sergeant Bell, one of the finest people I've ever worked with. And I felt if anybody knew what to do with this or could do anything about this -- you have to vent to somebody, and he's the guy I would vent to on this. I would never vent this to anybody else but him because he's the guy who can deal with stuff like this, if anybody.
- **Q**. You mean Sergeant Bell?
- A. Sergeant Bell is a great guy, yeah, he's tops.
 - **Q**. Now, after you sent this e-mail, you sent the final e-mail to Sergeant Bell?

- 1 **A.** Yes.
- \mathbf{Q} . And is that this e-mail?
- 3 A. Correct.
- Q. And that was sent a few weeks, about three or four weeks later, right?
- 6 A. Whenever I got the wi-fi signal back, yeah, at Starbucks.
 - **Q.** You indicate in that that you borrowed the wi-fi from Starbucks?
- 10 A. Yes.

9

17

- 11 **Q**. How were you getting access to the Internet during 12 this time in 2011? Did you have an Internet connection 13 at your house?
- 14 A. Yeah. I had a wi-fi signal that was coming into the house.
- 16 Q. You didn't pay for wi-fi service?
 - A. I'm not going to pay for the Internet, no.
- 18 Q. How would you access wi-fi?
- A. On the computer itself it has an automatic signal that it will pick up any open wi-fi that's in the area.
 - **Q**. Is that how you accessed the Internet?
- A. Yeah. You turn on the computer, and it sends out a signal to capture any wi-fi that may be out there.
- Q. Now, on the day that you were arrested, where were you living?

- **A**. In my home in Coventry.
- Q. At some point, did law enforcement come to your residence?
- 4 A. Yes, they did.

5

8

13

14

15

- **Q**. Do you remember about what time of the day it was?
- 6 A. It was early morning.
- 7 Q. Was it just one law enforcement officer?
 - A. There was a team. A team of people.
- 9 **Q**. When they first came into the house, did they tell you why they were there?
- 11 A. I asked why they were there. They didn't want to 12 answer that question at that time.
 - **Q**. Did you fairly quickly move into the backyard?
 - A. Yes, we did. After about five or ten minutes.
 - Q. And when you got to the backyard, what happened?
- A. They started to ask me questions, talk to me. I

 told them I was not going to answer anything or talk to

 them until I knew why they were there.
- 19 Q. Did they tell you?
- A. Yes. They were quite cordial at that point, and they said that I was being charged with possession of child pornography. I said that's false. It's a false statement.
 - Q. When you said that was false --
- 25 A. Right. I don't buy child pornography.

- Q. And did they amplify their comment that you were being charged with child pornography?
- A. They said that I had bought Azov films, and I said, Yeah, I did buy Azov films, I said, but they're not child pornography, that they were naturist films.
 - **Q.** And was all this discussion taking place in the backyard?
 - A. Yes, it was.

7

8

- Q. And who was there besides yourself? Was
- 10 Mr. Connelly present?
- 11 A. Mr. Connelly and Sergeant Scott Kelly.
- 12 Q. Were they both there the whole time?
- 13 A. No. They were in and out, back and forth.
- Q. Now, you saw various invoices introduced earlier in this trial that had your signature on them, right, or initials. I think, right?
- 17 A. Yes, I did.
- 18 Q. Did you initial those invoices, sir?
- 19 A. Yes, I did.
- Q. And did Mr. Connelly or his associate ask you where the Azov videos were?
- 22 A. They either asked or I volunteered. I know I told 23 them where they were, absolutely.
- Q. At some point -- all this is taking place in the backyard, right, sir?

- 1 A. That's correct.
- 2 Q. At some point, were you asked for access to your
- 3 personal e-mail account?
- 4 A. Yes, I was.
- 5 **Q**. And did you give it to them?
- 6 A. Yes, I did.
- 7 Q. Did you have to give them a password or something?
- 8 A. There was a password, yes.
- 9 **Q**. Just a normal password?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. At some point -- you've seen the PowerPoint that
- 12 was introduced?
- 13 A. The PowerPoint, yes.
- 14 Q. You've seen that document?
- 15 **A.** Yes.
- 16 Q. At some point, were you asked about whether you
- were working on a presentation, or did that subject
- 18 come up somehow?
- 19 A. It came up. I said, Yeah, the only reason I had
- 20 the Azov was for the presentation.
- 21 Q. Did you volunteer that you were working on a
- 22 presentation?
- 23 A. Yes, I did.
- 24 Q. And in that context, was there also some
- 25 discussion about a movie called "The Dancing Boys of

Afghanistan"?

- A. Yes, there was.
- Q. What was that discussion?
- A. I mentioned that Azov was only a small portion of the materials that I was gathering for the presentation. And I had mentioned that one of the most recent films that I had purchased was called "The Dancing Boys of Afghanistan." It was a Public Broadcasting System movie about child trafficking in Afghanistan. And I just gave that as an example. I got tons of material for the presentation. It's not just Azov. And I actually said to them I think every police officer should see it. And they went and they got it.
- Q. When you told them about your presentation, did you tell them whether or not you had obtained permission from the Rhode Island -- let me finish the question -- if you obtained permission from the Rhode Island Department of Probation?
- A. They asked if I had, and I said I had not.
- **Q**. And did you tell them why you had not obtained permission?
 - A. No. There was no need to. It was in the very initial stages of being developed. If I was even going to go through the Department of Corrections, it would

have been much later on. As we heard earlier, it's like ten days before you put the presentation on. I didn't have a presentation at that point in time. Plus, I could have done it out of my own professional license and I actually didn't have to do it under a license at all. Anybody can do a presentation if they want to. But it was in the very, very initial stages of development.

- **Q**. Was there any discussion about nudism while you were in the backyard?
- A. Yeah. It came up I guess because the films are nudists films. I am a nudist. I live a nudist lifestyle.
- **Q**. And did you give them any details about the way you lived your lifestyle as a nudist?
- A. I mentioned I had a site up in Connecticut and that I'd spend weekends there when I could get a chance during warmer weather.
- **Q**. At some point, was there a discussion about whether you were concerned about boys in the Azov Films -- let me back up.

Are you familiar with the term "grooming" in terms of the kind of work that you do?

A. Yes.

Q. Can you tell us what that is?

- A. It means you condition a child to feel comfortable with their environment, with their setting, with the people that are there. And then when that child feels comfortable, safe and secure and trusts the people that are with them, then they lapse into encouraging the child to do behaviors the child shouldn't be doing or isn't healthy for the child.
- **Q**. Did you say at some point that you were concerned about boys in the Azov films being groomed?
- A. I had mentioned that earlier, yes.
- **Q**. And did you say that to the officers?
- 12 A. Yes, I did.
 - **Q**. And why was that, sir, for the same reasons as you set forth in the letter to Ken Bell?
- **A**. Right.

- 16 Q. E-mail to Ken Bell, excuse me.
 - A. Right. Part of the conversation was that I had sent the letter to Ken Bell. I'm not sure exactly where it was in the conversation, but it came up. I said, Yeah, I did have concerns they started this adult porn site and that some of the kids from the Azov films were allegedly into the adult site. And I was concerned because there's no link, again, between naturism and adult pornography, that some of these kids were being groomed to enter into adult pornography.

- **Q**. Did you at some point say that the Azov Films may have crossed the line?
- A. If it went into the adult pornography and if these kids were being groomed for that purpose, was there like a shortcut where these kids were being groomed and they decided to lapse into some kind of adult pornography -- I mean, child pornography or something like that, behind the scenes or whatever.
- **Q**. Was there some discussion while you were in the backyard about the producers of Azov going to jail or something like that?
- A. By that time it had been established the site had been closed down. I inquired if something had happened behind the scenes. Things, again, you don't see in the films but maybe there was something going on behind the scenes where these kids might have been harmed or persuaded to do things they shouldn't be doing. The indication I had was that that had occurred. I said, well -- I asked if the guys were in prison that had produced the films. And my understanding is that they were. And I said, Well, that's good. You know, they're bad guys. If they've hurt those kids, they're bad guys and they should be in jail.
- **Q**. Now, when you said, "If they hurt these kids," were you referring to producing the Azov films?

- A. No. Not producing the Azov Films, not producing the Boy Joy films, but if there were things behind the scenes, that there was another layer -- they talked about a second layer of films that I didn't get into, didn't find out about, don't know what it's all about. If those second layer of films were -- or even if they weren't but there was something going on and even maybe in a different forum where these kids were involved either -- well, say child pornography or if they were doing something even -- you know, I didn't even think about it until now but child prostitution or something like that, I don't know. Something bad behind the scenes anyways, nothing to do with the Azov films and nothing to do with the Boy Joy films.
- **Q**. Did you have a discussion with Mr. Connelly about one of the Azov films that is in evidence that involved a boy and a chicken?
- A. Yes, I did.
 - Q. Piece of chicken?
- 20 A. Yes.

- **Q**. And what was that discussion, sir?
- A. You know, I was -- I guess we were both getting a little frustrated because to me Azov films are naturist films. They were saying there's pornography. I said, Just tell me one film where there's anything that's

- sexual or illegal in it. And Mr. Connelly mentioned, well, the kid sat on some chicken. And I said, Well, he sat on some chicken. I said, It's rude, crude obnoxious, maybe ridiculous. I'll give that. And maybe inappropriate. I'll give that. I said, But it's definitely not sex and it's not illegal. And I repeated, Can you tell me anything, any film that has anything sexual in it.
- Q. Let me just focus on -- I'm sorryf?
- A. I said, Or illegal. And he didn't respond.
- **Q**. Did you think at that point that the movie involving the young boy and the piece of chicken was pornographic?
- **A**. Oh, no. Absolutely not.
 - Q. Did you think it was sexual at all?
- A. No. That's not sex.

- **Q**. Did you tell Mr. Connelly that you felt the children in the Azov films were being exploited?
 - A. I never remember using that term. I remember saying that I was concerned that they might be being groomed for the purpose of adult pornography.
 - **Q**. So you acknowledge that you were concerned about the fear that they might be being groomed?
 - **A.** I was definitely concerned about the kids. For sure.

- 1 Q. Now, did you purchase films from Azov, sir?
- 2 A. Yes, I did.

8

9

10

11

12

15

- Q. And do you know about how long back Azov was in existence?
 - A. The catalog went back to about 2005.
- Q. How did you come into contact with the Azov website?
 - A. When I mentioned earlier I had Googled Amazon, on Amazon I was looking for whatever I was looking for at the time, I actually don't remember, but it linked into Azov and that's how I discovered it. And it had an Amazon discount.
- 13 Q. Did you buy things from Azov?
- 14 A. Yes, I did.
 - Q. For what period of time approximately?
- 16 A. From October of 2010 to April 2011.
- Q. Were there any indications when you were buying from Azov from the website that made you think that they were other than a naturist website?
 - A. None.
- Q. Did you have any indications that it was a safe site?
- 23 A. Yes, I did.
- 24 Q. What were those, sir?
- 25 A. There were multiple reasons. They had their

introductory, which we've all seen. They had the history of naturism, which we've all seen. It was an open website. They had contact information. There was no hiding anything. It went back to 2005. If something was illegal, it wouldn't be around since 2005. That's for sure. There was just a beaucoup of stuff there, looked just like any other naturist website that I've seen.

- **Q**. Was there anything secretive about the way you ordered materials off the website?
- A. None whatsoever. As a matter of fact, just the opposite. I wanted people to know where I go on the Internet. If you go on the Internet, everybody knows where you are. You might as well be sitting in downtown Providence with your computer because everybody knows where you are when you're on the Internet. I absolutely wanted everyone to know exactly where I went, exactly where I bought, and I brought it exactly to my home so there could be no question about where I went on that website. I absolutely didn't want anybody thinking I went anywhere and purchased anything that I didn't purchase on the Internet.
- **Q**. You heard either Sergeant Krawczyk or Mr. Ross from the Toronto Police Department say that the website blocked certain police addresses from accessing the

- 1 website. Did you have any idea of that, sir?
- A. None. I had no problem getting onto that site whatsoever.
 - Q. You had no idea that they were blocking law enforcement?
- A. It was as easy as getting on any other naturistwebsite.
 - **Q**. Is the process similar to as when you went onto Amazon or something like that?
- 10 A. It was right through Amazon, same as any other website.
- 12 **Q**. Was there discounts for certain materials on the website?
- 14 A. Yeah. It was an Amazon discount. They ran 15 specials every now and then.
- Q. Now, you've seen before the trial today thevarious invoices that were introduced into evidence --
- 18 A. Yes.

5

8

- 19 Q. -- in this case, haven't you?
- 20 A. Yes, I have.
- Q. And you've reviewed copies of those, haven't you, sir?
- 23 A. Yes, I have.
- Q. You don't dispute that you bought these various films through Azov, do you?

A. Absolutely not, no.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

- Q. Did you in preparation for your testimony at some point figure out about how many titles you'd ordered from Azov?
 - A. My total was 69. I know that's different than the prosecution's where they had that double order but -- I didn't double order, but if they want to dispute it, I'm not going to dispute it. I don't care. It's not that big a difference. But my total was 69.
 - **Q**. Would you agree that there's a second order for six that appears duplicative?
 - A. There were six that were duplicate one day to the next. That seems to me just to be an error.
 - Q. One way or the other, you ordered either 69 or 75?
 - A. At least 69. If they want to say 75, I'm not going to argue over the difference.
 - **Q**. And were all of those films that you ordered from Azov, Azov production films or were some of them produced by other people?
- 20 A. Some were what I call commercial because they were 21 other films.
- Q. Did you calculate before coming in here how many of those films you bought were not from Azov?
- 24 A. Roughly 21.
- 25 Q. Would that be 21 out of the 69?

- 1 A. That's correct.
- Q. If you included the 75, would it be a higher number that were not from Azov?
- 4 A. Yes. I didn't figure from that number, though.
- 5 MR. MANN: Let me just return these three exhibits.
- Q. Well, the two duplicative ones were the ones for November 5th. Do you see that one, sir?
 - A. No, I don't see it.
- 10 Q. Do you see it now, sir?
- 11 A. Yes, I see it now.
- 12 Q. November 6th, right, sir?
- 13 A. Correct.

- 14 **Q**. And November 5th has seven and November 6th has six, right?
- 16 A. Correct.
- Q. And is it fair to say that the six on November 6th are also on the invoice for November 5th?
- 19 A. That is correct, yes.
- Q. And out of those six, how many of those six were Azov productions?
- 22 A. The last two, "Barefooted" and "Capital Fellows."
- 23 **Q**. So four were not, right?
- 24 A. Four were not.
- 25 **Q**. So it would be fair to say that based on your

- 1 previous numbers that if you had 69 individual titles,
- 2 it was 21 that were not Azov but if you included the
- 3 | 75, it would be 25, right?
- 4 A. I guess that would be true, yes.
- 5 Q. On the date of your arrest, had you opened all the
- 6 Azov films that you had ordered?
- 7 A. No, I had not.

- Q. Do you know about how many you had not opened?
- 9 A. There were 13 in the hard cases, and about 4 in the white envelopes.
- 11 Q. Was Azov the only place you bought DVDs from, sir?
- 12 A. I buy DVDs from a lot of places.
- 13 Q. Do you have any estimate of the size of your total
- 14 DVD collection on the date of your arrest?
- 15 A. I would say at the minimum would be 500 and go up
- 16 from there, for sure.
- 17 Q. What types of films did you buy, sir?
- 18 A. I bought all kinds of films, mostly horror films
- because they're the cheapest, but comedy, drama, lots
- 20 of documentaries about the various wars and stuff and
- 21 about different events in history besides the wars.
- 22 Travel movies. Sci-fi is my favorite.
- 23 Q. Did you also buy naturist films?
- 24 A. Yes, I did. Yes, I did.
- Q. What is a naturist film?

- A. Naturist films are nude recreation involved of allages, from infant to grandparents.
 - Q. Did you buy -- what are coming-of-age films?
 - A. Coming-of-age films are adolescents that are in trouble, that they have difficult lives. And the films depict -- a lot of them are true-life stories of youth who have had difficulty growing up, and they call them coming-of-age. It's usually teenagers.
 - Q. Did you buy educational films?
- 10 A. Yes, I did.

- 11 Q. What types of educational films did you buy?
- 12 A. On human growth.
- **Q**. Pardon?
 - A. On human growth.
 - **Q**. Why on that subject?
 - A. I wanted information for the presentation. When you do a presentation you don't just do the psychological stuff. Whenever you do a presentation that involves thought, you also bring in issues of physiology because you have to elimination the physiology as an issue before you start dealing with the mental health issues.
 - **Q**. When you purchased these films from Azov, can you describe the process that you used?
- 25 A. I used the regular Internet process where you

- 53
- order online, you use your credit card, and they send
- 2 it to you in the mail.
- 3 Q. Whose name was the credit card in?
- 4 **A**. Mine.
- 5 Q. Did you get a monthly bill for the credit card?
- 6 A. Yes, I did.
- 7 **Q**. Where was that bill mailed to?
- 8 A. Sent to my home.
- 9 Q. The Azov films that you ordered, where did you
- 10 have those mailed to?
- 11 A. To my home.
- 12 Q. Under who's name?
- 13 **A**. My name.
- 14 Q. Did you take any steps at all to conceal your
- 15 identity when ordering these films?
- 16 A. Absolutely none.
- 17 **Q**. Had you also purchased naturist films from other
- 18 producers than Azov?
- 19 A. Yes, I had.
- 20 Q. Can you identify any of the other producers from
- 21 whom you purchased naturist films, sir?
- 22 A. There was one I think that was mentioned earlier.
- 23 It was "Russian Bare," B-A-R-E. "Euro-vid," E-U-R-0
- 24 dash V-I-D, and "Odess."
- 25 Q. Can you briefly summarize or describe the contents

- of the naturist films you bought from those?
- A. Again, it's nude recreation from infant to
 grandparents, all aspects of life. Naturist lifestyle
 is basically recreation without clothes.
 - **Q**. Did these films have just young -- do these films have just boys and young boys, or did they have other people in them, too?
 - A. The majority of them had families.
 - **Q**. Were they nude?
- 10 A. Yes.

- **Q**. When you bought films from other distributors, how did you do that?
 - A. Same process as the ones from Azov. I used my credit card. Sometimes they were ordered through -- there's a magazine called "Internaturally," which actually has gone out of business. But they had a catalog there, too, so that would be through the mail. "Russian Bare" was through the same process as Azov.
 - Q. Did you view all the films you purchased?
- **A**. Not all, no.
 - **Q**. Why not?
 - A. I overbuy.
- **Q**. Pardon?
- A. I overbuy. Something is on sale I'll buy it and then hold onto it until some further point.

Q. Why did you purchase -- let me back up.

Were the Azov Films' naturist films you purchased different than some of the other naturist films?

- A. These again were primarily was all boys.
- Q. Why did you purchase Azov films, sir?
- A. Because I wanted something that was non-sexual, that I felt the Azov films were all male, which is totally non-sexual in my world, and it provided the visual imagery that I wanted for the presentation.

And if I had used the commercial films that I already had, they're more intense because they're dealing with the trauma of children and I didn't want the intensity to be in the film that led into the conversation and presentation. I wanted the conversation to be intense, not the film that was introducing the topic for conversation. And the Azov films obviously provided that.

- **Q**. Why not use some of the naturist films you already had?
- A. There were three films from the family films where the men went one place and the women went another place. When the men went one place, it was all male, but there wasn't the variety of activities. There wasn't the consistency of the participants as far as

- who they were and things like that where Azov had the all-male films, which again to me is very neutral. They had a variety of activities. Some of the participants went from when they were young, say, I don't know, 6, 8, whatever, until 12, 14 or something like that, and gave a flow to the film so that could be shown later on in the presentation.
- **Q**. Did you make a conscious decision not to include in your presentation films that depicted nude women or nude girls?
- A. I wanted to stay away from that. I wanted the conversation to be about the topic that was being presented; and unfortunately, society has stereotyped nude females in a sexual way. And I was concerned that if I used nude females, it would become about sexual issues not about the issues that I wanted to be discussed within the film. I didn't want any sexual content within the film itself.
- **Q**. When you sort of were initially conceiving this idea of a presentation, was it in response to questions you had been asked?
- A. Yes, it was.

- **Q**. Can you explain that.
- A. I've been around a long time. I've been around in social rehab for 30 years. And when people find out

especially that I worked with sex offenders, there are two main questions that they always ask. One is how could any adult on the face of the planet look at a child and see them in a sexual way. And number two is with all we know about predators in our society, how can they keep finding victims. And this is the persistent questions that come up over and over again, and this is what, to me, the audience wants to know. felt that if I'm going to do a presentation, I have to answer their questions first and then present the information that I think is relevant for them to protect themselves and to get to know themselves as This is a multifaceted presentation. It wasn't just about Azov. It wasn't just about the initial part of the presentation.

- **Q**. What type of -- the format for your presentation was going to be a PowerPoint; is that correct?
- A. That's correct.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- **Q**. And how did you think the Azov films would help you make the presentation in response to these questions?
- **A**. In addition to the first two questions that are asked of me quite often, there is a general interest among the people I work with, I work with some very intense law enforcement, CPIs and other folks.

Q. What is a CPI?

A. I'm sorry. Child protective investigator, which is usually DCYF or some version of that in other states. So they work for DCYF. If there's an assault on a child, they go out just like a lot of police officers. They see the bloody bodies. They see the horrors that happen to children in person. And they have a lot of questions about things as well as to how to get to this point, what could have been done to prevent this from happening, and I try to provide that information on an individual basis but I really wanted to do it on a global basis so there were more people at one time rather than just doing one person at a time.

And in answer to your question also, one of the questions they commonly ask is about child pornography. And you can't see child pornography, I'm just telling you right now, it's impossible, you cannot do that.

I was hopeful that through presentation through Azov, which is totally legal, totally non-sexual films, that I might be able to help bridge the gap, so to speak, between what is good nudity, what is bad nudity. There's good touch, bad touch. Good nudity, bad nudity. By showing the good nudity I might be able to present to the audience what it is not. By showing them what it is not, you cannot show them what it is

but you can show them what it is not in a very subtle way, then they can have better focus on what it may be. That's my thinking on it. Whether it was going to happen or not, that was my thinking on that particular part.

And the Azov films, again, being all male, totally non-sexual, I didn't think we'd have a problem with that.

- Q. Now, you didn't view Azov as child pornography, did you?
- A. Absolutely not, no.

- **Q**. But you don't deny that some people try to access child pornography through the Internet?
- **A**. I would imagine that as they do for any child, anywhere, they would try to do that for these films as well.

THE COURT: Mr. Mann, would this be a good time to take a break? I just don't know where you are.

MR. MANN: This would be a good time to take a break, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. Very good.

So ladies and gentlemen, let's take our morning break. You'll find a snack in the jury room waiting for you. Please keep in mind all the instructions I've given you many times. I'll try not to repeat them

anymore but you know what they are. And Charlie will 1 2 show you out. We'll take about ten minutes. 3 (Proceedings out of the presence of the jury as follows:) 4 5 THE COURT: We'll be in recess for ten minutes. (Recess.) 6 7 THE COURT: Counsel, I'm handing down the 8 revised jury instructions so that if we get to that 9 point shortly, which I think we may, you have them. 10 Are we ready to bring the jury back in? 11 MR. DONNELLY: Your Honor, if I could address 12 one more time the jury instruction that's on the record 13 that the Government objected to, would the Court be 14 open to any more argument on that based on the 15 Defendant's direct examination thus far, the constant 16 references to it's perfectly legal and the like? 17 THE COURT: I may. I'm thinking about it. And 18 I'll take that up with counsel before we get to the 19 point where I charge the jury. 20 Thank you, your Honor. MR. DONNELLY: 21 THE COURT: So let's bring the jury in. 22 (Proceedings in the presence of the jury as 23 follows:) 24 THE COURT: Welcome back, ladies and gentlemen. 25 And Mr. Mann, you may continue with your

examination.

1

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

15

24

MR. MANN: Thank you.

- Q. Mr. Silva, how far -- at the time of your arrest, how far along were you in completing your proposed presentation?
- A. I was at the very initial stages of thepresentation.
 - Q. And were there reasons why you weren't further along?
 - A. Yes. I had obligations at work that prevented me from spending more time on the presentment.
- Q. When did you do most of the work on the presentation?
- 14 A. Nights and weekends.
 - Q. Did you ever ask permission from your employer?
- 16 **A**. For --
- 17 Q. To work on this presentation?
- 18 A. No, I did not. No.
- 19 **Q**. Why not?
- A. It had nothing to do with the Department of Corrections.
- Q. In addition to purchasing the DVDs from Azov, did you download certain materials from the Azov web page?
 - A. They had previews and things like that, yes.
- Q. Were they similar to the things we've seen?

1 **A.** Yes.

4

- Q. Did you ever distribute any of the Azov materials
- 3 you had with anyone?
 - A. No, I did not.
 - **Q**. Did you ever share them with anyone?
- 6 A. No, I did not.
- 7 Q. Now, you've seen I think it's Exhibit 34, the
- 8 PowerPoint presentation that was introduced, right?
- 9 A. The PowerPoint presentation, yes.
- 10 Q. You created that, right?
- 11 A. Yes, I did.
- 12 Q. About how many slides -- let me back up.
- There were multiple versions on your computer in
- 14 the thumb drive when it was seized, right?
- 15 A. Correct.
- 16 Q. The largest one had about 33 slides on it?
- 17 A. Correct.
- 18 **Q**. How many slides did you anticipate would
- eventually be in the completed presentation?
- 20 A. I anticipated it would be a minimum of about a
- 21 hundred.
- 22 **Q**. When did you first begin working on this
- 23 presentation?
- A. I've been gathering material for 30 years. I made
- a determination in 2009 to do something about it and

started actively working on it probably around like October 2010.

- **Q**. What made you decide that you wanted to start working on such a presentation?
- A. In 2009, I turned 55. And once a year I do a self-assessment. I reviewed my life. I stop everything. I reviewed my life. Where am I, who am I, am I being the person I'm supposed to be, where am I going, how am I doing on my goals.

When I turned 55, I realized that I wasn't very happy, that I lost my sense of humor, that my child dream of winning the lottery and saving the world was not going to happen. There was a lot of death around me, people I knew, people I didn't know. Some people were retiring, actually, too. So I got in touch with my own mortality. So I figured I needed to do something to correct that situation. I'm not getting religious on you because it's not a religious thing, but used the Serenity Prayer, the things you have control over, the things you don't have control over, things you need to know the difference.

And from that I decided, if I count the scouting time, I had 40 years of experience roughly to share with people, working with a population nobody wants to work with, people don't want to talk about them, they

don't want to hear about them, they don't want to see them. That includes the kids. That includes the kids. So I had a unique perspective on things because I work with people nobody else does. And I got tremendous

could have been different for them, how it might be

information from these individuals as to how things

7 different for others.

So I came to the conclusion the best thing for me to do was not to teach at a university, not to write a book and not to go back into private practice, but to do a seminar, do a training that I could share this 30, 40 years worth of information, get it out there, you save the world and I'm going to go travel. So that's how it all came about, and that's how I decided to do the presentation.

- **Q**. About when did you first start using the PowerPoint tool as a method to sort of format this?
- A. Starting somewhere in late 2009, maybe, again, October -- excuse me. Into 2010, October 2010, I was gathering information, putting it on paper and then I got the PowerPoint format itself, the actual PowerPoint. Apparently -- I didn't know it myself but it came up around July of 2011. I'm comfortable with that because I don't know when I got the actual PowerPoint itself, and then I started to implement the

- stuff that I had compiled onto the computer into the PowerPoint presentation.
- **Q**. Was there an initial targeted audience for this presentation?
- A. Yes, there was. I had targeted -- I had played with it. It's different on the screen that you'll see, but I had targeted law enforcement that does primarily in the field of sex offenders and CPIs because they definitely deal with sex offenders and their victims.

 And I felt they were the people that would benefit from it most.
- **Q**. Did you anticipate producing other presentations for other audiences based in part on the materials in the first presentation?
- A. Absolutely. As I mentioned earlier, the 40 years of experience that I had wasn't just with sex offenders and their victims. I had worked with families, with schools, a whole variety of people. And I definitely was going to use the core material. This is the big one. And there's core material within that presentation that I could extrapolate out of that and do trainings, not on this, different kind of training, but beneficial for parents, for clinicians, for teachers, for correctional officers and actually for people that are in prison, believe it or not, had

things that I wanted to deal with them from my experience as a probation officer so when they get out they might be able to do some things differently. All my presentations were not going to be about the sex crimes, the stuff like that.

- Q. How did the Azov Films fit into this?
- A. This particular one?
- Q. And in general.

A. There weren't going to be any other presentations. Azov was strictly for this population because they work in this field. The officers and the CPIs, they deal with a world that you hopefully will never, ever see. It's a dark, dark place that we work in.

And Azov is nowhere near concerning to these folks. Where it fit as I mentioned earlier is that it helps address some of the things that they were talking about and you have a visual catalyst to a conversation. I'm a visual learner. A lot of people learn visually. And this gave you a basic insight into the different topics that were at hand. Gives you a visual connection. It's basic, it's innocent, and it's natural. The birth of a conversation. I don't want to get philosophical, but I thought that was pretty cool.

And then from that, those conversation were to go into a larger conversation that goes to the very

dark places of our society.

And then in the second phase of the presentation, we were going to address those things as to how to correct those things and prevent them with their children, their children. Because while they're taking care of you and me, they're neglecting their own kids. You need to know that. Okay?

And then the third part of that was going to be where I'd address them, the officers in the room. You cannot protect your children if you do not know who you are, what your biases are, what your blind spots are and the things that you're not willing to see. It goes outside of your bubble of safety. That happens for officers as well. Okay?

So it's a multi-phase thing. By using the Azov Films, there's no women in it, there's no females. It stayed out of the sexual realm. If I used some of the commercial films, if you think about the movie "Kids" or "Prince of Tides," those are very intense movies. They're very intense. And I'm not into that kind of intensity. I don't want the intensity in the movie. I want the intensity in the conversation. I believe that Azov had that nice, calm, subtle way of getting into the conversation.

MR. MANN: I'd ask this be marked Defendant's D

Some people call them bullets, some people

Were those notes on the presentation on the

computer when your computer and thumb drive were

22

23

24

25

topics.

Q.

call them triggers.

seized?

- A. Yes, they were.
 - MR. MANN: I'd move Exhibit D as a full exhibit.
 - MR. DONNELLY: No objection, your Honor.
- MR. MANN: Your Honor, I made a motion to introduce Exhibit D as a full exhibit. I don't think the Government has an objection.

THE COURT: D? Is there any objection?

MR. DONNELLY: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: D will be admitted in full.

(Defendant's Exhibit D admitted in full.)

- **Q**. I want to show you some of these slides and walk our way through some of this presentation, okay, sir?
- A. Sure.
- Q. This is the first page, right?
- A. That is correct.
- **Q**. And was there a reason you were emphasizing the male gender?
 - A. Yes. Again, the title and address is one of the questions that are asked of me by a multitude of people, and I wanted to emphasize just on the male gender because the vast majority of people that I worked with were males. I did work with females, but you could even do a 90/10 split, mostly males. And I didn't want to get into the females end of things

because I think it would have got -- there would be some mention of it, but the emphasis is going to be on the males because that's my specialty.

- Q. Now, the second slide, that one says something about Red Pill Productions. What does "Red Pill Productions" refer to, sir?
- A. I want to apologize to the prosecution because hopefully they didn't spend a lot of time on this. I made this up. This is kind of a joke screen, in a sense, that on the Red Pill Productions, Unincorporated, there's no such thing. I made that up. It refers to "The Matrix." Because besides these Azov films, there were going to be other films that were not of coming-of-age, but there was going to be "The Matrix," there was going to be "The Simpsons," there was going to be "South Park." There was going to be a whole bunch of films in here as well as "Dateline" and news stories and so forth.

But anyways, the Red Pill Productions refers to "The Matrix." In "The Matrix," the movie, if you haven't seen it, it won't make a lot of sense to you, but Morpheus is handing Neo two pills. You take the blue pill, you go back, you live the life you're living now, totally naive about anything that's going on. You take the red pill, you see the world as it is.

Once you see the world as it is, there isn't any going back. And even though this was for law enforcement, and CPIs, some might be new. And they need to know, I'm not joking around about this stuff, there's going to be some hardcore things in here. I've seen some horrible things in life that I was going to present. I was assuming I was going to get some stuff back from the audience as well and there was going to be a hardcore discussion. Okay?

Once you get into that kind of discussion, you can't say I don't want to notice it anymore, because one you know it, you know it and you're in it. Okay?

So it's kind of giving an indication something is coming up here. If you're not prepared for it, you should kind of leave now.

Q. What did "Ambush Bay" mean?

A. "Ambush Bay" means this. As I mentioned earlier, in order to, I believe, to educate people is that first you have to answer their questions. If you answer their questions, then you have their respect. That's the two questions I mentioned earlier about how could any adult see any child as a sexual object, which the short answer to that is you can't. If you don't, you cannot do that. It's impossible. And the second one being that how do they continue to find victims when we

know they're out there. That's primarily what this is about, this presentation.

But I want them to know things that they haven't asked. Again, I know that a lot of officers get divorces. I know a lot of officers' children get into trouble and so forth. While they're protecting us, their children are at risk. I want to help them become aware of that because they're so busy, they're married to their jobs. They can't be married to their jobs and have a family, too. They've got to just take care of their family.

The second phase was going to be the things we know about what these bad guys are doing, how do we counter that with our children.

And the third part, you can't do that efficiently with your children if you don't know who you are. Okay? So the ultimate part of this whole presentation is not about the guy seducing kids, it's not about protecting your children. It's about who you are, that person in that audience, who are you and what are you doing and what are your limitations based on your blind spots that would prevent you from protecting your own child. That's who I really care about in that audience is the officer, take care of yourself so you can take care of your children, so you can prevent the

- predators from getting to your child. That's the ambush part. Okay?
- Q. On Slide 3, first of all, do you see the note below that?
 - A. Yes.

9

10

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q. Just in general, the difference between this and Exhibit 34 is the existence of these notes?
- 8 A. Say again?
 - Q. Is the difference between this Exhibit D and --
 - A. The notes below are different, yes.
- 11 \mathbf{Q} . This one has the notes in it, right?
- 12 A. Correct.
- Q. And those notes were -- now, was this a slide that you were going to change?
 - A. That's the one I was going to change, yeah. I kept changing the presentation. As you know, there were four different versions. I had come to the conclusion I was just going to do law enforcement and CPIs because I think they're in the dark part of dealing with society that I felt safe that wasn't going to traumatize anybody in that group.
 - **Q**. The fourth slide indicates people you were not going to invite. Why were you not going to invite certain people?
- A. Simply because, again, this was going to be a very

intense conversation. I don't have vanilla stuff here. This was going to be a hardcore presentation with hardcore information. For example, where it says at the bottom there are people still dealing with their own victimization. You cannot come to a presentation like this and not be traumatized by it if you have not taken care of your own issues so they should not be coming. And survivors are people who have come to terms with their own victimization. Obviously, they could come to a presentation like this and not be traumatized by it.

The others, again, they're not into the dark world as far as the law enforcement is and CPIs are, and I wanted to try this out very much so with a safer crowd of people, people who are not going to walk away from there being any worse off because of what they've seen and heard.

- **Q**. Now, many of these slides are self-explanatory, aren't they, sir?
- A. I would say, so, yes.

- **Q**. Can we jump forward now to Slide Number 9. Can you tell me what that slide is.
- A. This is the core concept that was going to go from this particular presentation to every one of the other presentations. If anything happened within the

presentation, this is what had to happen. If this didn't occur, the entire presentation was lost. This was going to be about an hour-long discussion about how we develop psychologically. Again, this is not about the physical. There's nothing physical in this presentation. It's about the thought process, how we think, the psychological blocks that we have, how we can recognize them and how we can overcome them.

And part of that, again, is where you have the basic physiologies how you grow up as a human body. There's also the average norm. There's no such thing as normal anymore. There's average normal. How people develop intellectually. And its starts off -- we start off in an emotional state, responding to things and then we transition like a DNA through adolescence. If you had the terrible twos, wait until you get to the turbulent teens because they are really a handful.

And we always talk about the physical. They have a psychological development happening there, too. And that psychological development is where the intelligence, which was the secondary response when they are younger is now struggling to become the primary response to stimulus. And it is quite turbulent for them. They're losing their childhood. They haven't quite gained their adulthood yet, and

there's a real transition that happens. I deal with a lot of adults. There was going to be various versions of this. I have worked with a lot of adults who have not made that transition to the intelligence being the primary response to their situation, and it has to be very difficult lives. So this was going to be an extremely intense presentation about the different aspects of that is how we move in our lives from me to we and take on more of a global concept in our lives. And it's of extreme importance for your children, and it's also for the officers that are involved as well as the guys that are predators. That was an extremely important part of this presentation. If nothing else, that had to be done right.

- Q. I want to jump forward to Slide 11, just briefly. Slide 11, first, what are you talking about in Slide 11?
- A. Well, again, this was an initial slide. And the reason I put that top one, I actually got that from a different presentation and that's an adult concept, that the body's largest sex organ, some people might dispute it, but it's the skin. Okay? And that is not a child concept. Okay? A child's skin is not sexual to a child. Okay? Children use their skin the same way they use all their other senses is to interact with

the world. And it's the concept that's being distorted where now children and adults' perspectives are supposedly being the same and that is not correct.

What is happening is that when we're growing up -- I know when I was growing up you have to have human touch. I can't tell you how important that is. And now we've gone from good touch, bad touch to no touch. I think it's extremely dangerous in the way we're raising our children today. We don't have any positive interactions with other people physically, and I think that leaves them vulnerable to the bad guys.

And there's a whole bunch of examples about how that's being challenged in our society, and kids becoming more and more untouched. They're becoming the untouchables. Okay?

And at the bottom, there's a reference to the Azov film, which would involve wrestling. Boys wrestle, girls hug. That's just kind of a basic concept, but again it goes from good touch, bad touch to no touch.

- **Q**. Now, the prosecution, I think, referenced this particular picture.
- A. Correct.

- Q. Why did you use that picture?
- A. It's very simple, very basic but also brings out

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the point that I wanted to bring out. This is actually from 1887. It's May Bridge or White Bridge or something like that. It's actually a series. They're in textbooks actually for kids where he did a series of films or shots, stills, where a boy would start running or an adult, or whoever. He did thousands of these, and he would just film them as they went along. He was the precursor to movies.

And I've used this concept many times just to kind of wake people up. I've been in trainings and I've said to people the natural state of a child is And they go, Ahh. And because you don't want to talk about it and they go, That's true. I said, Yeah, it's a concept we can't address in our society. And I said, We have no place in our society for children to be nude legally or safely anymore and yet it's the natural state of a child. Plus the issue with this is, too, is that some people actually believe that a clothed child is safer than a nude child, which is not And we're distorting the reality of the situation as it exists with children. And there's a bigger conversation, obviously, about this, about how the bad guy could come in and take advantage of our fear of dealing with that particular issue.

Q. I'm jumping ahead to Slide 22. There's a

reference in the footnotes here to Azov necklaces and bracelets. What was that about?

- A. And this is another place where Azov comes up later on actually. That's my footnote for later on, you see that screen later on. Where this would come into play is that the Azov characters went to a particular location. They've all got bracelets. They're extremely happy about being part of a special group. They all had their bracelets. There was a great enjoyable activity and it was going to emphasize in the conversation about how important it is for kids to belong to something special. And the emphasis is a strong desire to belong to something special that again can be used against them if it's not done appropriately.
- Q. Now, you have a Slide 24 that's very short.
- A. Let me explain that.

THE COURT: Wait. Wait. Let Mr. Mann finish his question then you can answer.

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, sir.

- **Q**. Can you explain this slide.
- A. I apologize for interrupting.

Yeah. Again, this is very basic things. This is more of a teaser frame. Girls are not denser or simpler or anything than boys when it comes to being

seduced. Really get that message across. Okay?

What this means was it's a reference to that society has aided the bad guy in sexualizing teenage females or young females. And that's a fact, that society is really sexualizing females in our society. They're doing half the work of the perp, and I don't really think we're paying close attention to how we're doing that to the young women in our society, so that women are becoming more vulnerable with the help of society.

- **Q.** I want to show you briefly Slide 26. I just want you to notice there are a lot of footnotes on that slide, aren't there, sir?
- A. That's correct, yes.
- **Q**. And in fact, they go over to the next page, don't they? They're all on this page but the printed part would be on the second page, isn't it?
- A. Yes.
- **Q**. Do you see it now, the second page?
- 20 A. Yes.

- **Q**. So my question to you is that just in general, why did you have a slide, for example, like this with so many different notes?
 - A. Again, the slide was just the beginning of the presentation. The presentation was not about the

slides. It was the ensuing conversation. And this part of the footnotes is to what would be done orally, not visually in the presentation. There are some references like there was the movie "Doubt" in there.

- Q. I want to show you I think it's Slide 30. Slide 30 has a number of references to Azov. Do you see those?
- A. Yes. I do.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Can you explain what Slide 30 was all about?
- This was just a film that had the concepts that Α. were mentioned earlier. This would either be shown in unison with them or after discussion, however it was going to take place. Again, this was the very beginning of the whole process of developing these 33 We were still going to take a long time to get But I had designated each one of these topics discussed earlier and added a few more and the various movies that were going to be shown to get the visual stimulus to get the mind thinking and get the catalyst for the conversation going. Mostly Azov, as I mentioned, it was not a frivolous thing that Azov was going to be in here. They were definitely going to be into the presentation, and there's a reference to some of the coming-of-age films that weren't that intense.
- Q. Can you explain, for example, the first Azov

reference is "The Egor."

- A. As I mentioned earlier --
- Q. Can you explain what that one is?
- A. Yes, I can. As I mentioned earlier, some of the family naturist films had some just all male films but they were not consistency of character that we find in Azov. Azov goes from the same character from when he's 6 until he's 12 or 14. They've been around a long time, apparently, and they provide that continuity of flow. And "Egor" was going to be part of a conversation of -- this was going to actually end up in a conversation about street gangs, just so you know. So we start off with the Azov film. He starts off young. He's fine with his lifestyle. He's fine with everything. A lot of kids might not be into a naturist lifestyle. He certainly is. He's happy with it, and he's doing well.

If you take that to the negative after we get into the conversation with law enforcement and so forth, you end up in a conversation as how do kids end up in gangs. And there are other issues, too.

So it's the subtle way you get the basic innocent, natural way of getting into a conversation about something that's really dark down the line. And then of course the next part of the presentation, we'd

- be talking about what can we do to prevent that

 happening so we get the kids young, we develop them to

 where we want them to be.
 - **Q**. How did the Azov film particularly relate to the first example, the "Egor" example?
 - A. The what, please?
- Q. How did the Azov films relate particular to the "Egor," the first for example?
 - A. That's what I mentioned. "Egor" was from young to old. He'd been around for a long time in films.
 - **Q.** Not going through all of these, take the second one, "Bait Boy," what's the relationship with Azov?
 - A. The "Bait Boy" one?
- **Q**. Yes.

- A. "Bait Boy" is again where -- that's my term, just so you know, is what one boy helps another boy in this case feel comfortable with being with a new crowd, being in new surroundings, whatever, and helps him acclimate to the situation, whatever, the environment. And of course that is used by bad guys, some of the examples down below is where people used kids to lure other kids in for sexual gratification.
- **Q**. The wrestling one, what was the point of the wrestling one?
- 25 A. I had mentioned earlier the wrestling was part of

the whole process. We all need to be touched. Girls hug; boys wrestle. And in wrestling now comes from again where you had the good touch, you had bad touch and now we're into no touch.

- **Q**. Let's skip down to the one where you have "What the hell, Azov." What were you referencing?
- A. That's the chicken movie right there, you know. And the chicken movie is about the shock effect. Anybody who has worked with kids, if you have a kid and you haven't had this happen yet, it happens with teachers, clinicians and a lot of other people as well, parents in particular, boys will shock you. Okay? They will shock you. I think girls will do it, too, but we're talking about boys. We're going to keep a male focus, if that's all right. I'm not trying to exclude women but we'll keep it a male focus. Boys will shock you. And if you're not prepared for it, then you will react probably in a way you shouldn't do that.

What this extrapolates into is intense conversations about what is happening in our society in the United States where this kid is sitting on a chicken being totally gross, really getting it out there, he's really being disgusting and really shocking the audience at what he's doing. In the United States,

shock in the United States from teenagers, and think about what's been happening aside, I'm not going to give a whole lot of examples, relates to sex and violence. That's what's happening in our society. There's tons of samples out there as to how our kids are shocking us with those behaviors. And we're in a real bad place in our society when it comes to shock and awe. And I think there needs to be intense conversation as to how can we get that under control, how can we meet this need in a more appropriate manner where we don't end up having kids doing sexual things on the Internet and kids doing sexual things to others and kids shooting up schools and things like that. There's a lot of shock and awe.

And on the teacher end, just so you know, this is the dark end on the teacher and parent. And the big thing is don't panic. You know, when kids do shocking things, just don't panic and don't overreact.

- **Q**. There's a reference in the footnote, "Play Azov introduction to their product."
- A. Yeah, I want to make sure that, again, reinforcing that these are naturist films. I was going to be editing the films. I was very concerned about when I initially did it, I didn't want to be sued by Azov. I didn't want to be sued by some other side of this, any

of these other folks. I'm using a lot of commercial films, "Dateline," newspaper articles, advertisements.

I'm not paying any royalties to anybody, okay?

As part of this, too, as I said, I want to reinforce that even though I edited things in a certain way, and they may look a certain way that maybe I didn't intend them to look, these are naturist films. They've been severely edited. They've been manipulated to some extent. They may look like something they shouldn't look like. That's not the intention. And through that introduction, I just wanted to show that that's where they started off. If they ended up someplace different, that would be my apologies.

- Q. Now, you said that you were a nudist, right?
- A. Correct.

- \mathbf{Q} . What is nudism?
- 17 A. Nudism is recreation without clothes.
- **Q**. What is naturalism?
- 19 A. Just another word for nudism.
- 20 Q. How long have you been a nudist?
- 21 A. Since 1995.
 - **Q**. Do you belong to any nudist associations?
- A. Yes. The AANR, which is the American Association for Nude Recreation.
- 25 Q. You already told us you own land in a nudist park.

- A. Well, it's a site. I don't own the land, but it is a site that I own in Connecticut, yeah.
- Q. Would you say that you enjoy watching nudist or anaturist films?
 - A. Yes.

6

- **Q**. You bought a lot of Azov films, right?
- 7 A. Correct.
- Q. Did you ever think that any of the images in those films or the photo packs that came with them were child pornography?
- 11 A. No, I did not.
- 12 Q. Did you ever think they were lascivious?
- 13 A. No.
- 14 **Q**. Did you ever find sexual pleasure in viewing any of these photos or films?
- 16 A. Absolutely not.
- Q. Another question I should have asked earlier. You talked about being involved in Scouts for about ten years?
 - A. Correct.
- 21 **Q**. Did you ever go back to the scouting? Why not?
- A. When I was working for Eckert there, when you're
 the director of the program you live on the property.

 And then program director, too, and program specialist,
- and group -- the supervisor, that you actually live on

property. You're there 365 days a year, 24 hours a day. You're dedicated to that program. When I left that program, there were people I encountered in the community who asked -- you know, we have discussions about scouting and things that we did. They'd ask me to get back in the program. I said, yeah, to me it was like a second job when I was in it and I spent a lot of time on it and I just never wanted to do it again. It's just too time-consuming. I did my time and that's it, you know.

Q. Finally, sir, prior to this charge here, have you

- **Q**. Finally, sir, prior to this charge here, have you ever been charged or convicted of any crime?
- A. No, sir, I have not.

MR. MANN: Thank you.

That completes my direct examination, your Honor. I just have to return these exhibits to the clerk.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Mann.

MR. MANN: I think I did move it, yes, D was full.

THE COURT: You did. Thank you.

Mr. Donnelly, your cross-examination.

MR. MANN: Thank you, your Honor.

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. DONNELLY

Q. Mr. Silva, you were a probation officer close to

- 1 14 years -- excuse me, close to ten years?
- 2 A. Correct.
- Q. And during that time you talked a little bit about your work with Detective Bell, correct?
- 5 A. Correct.

16

17

18

19

- Q. Would it be fair to say that during that time you also worked with prosecutors, local law enforcement officials besides just the state police?
 - A. That is correct.
- Q. Did you go out on home visits with other lawenforcement officers besides Sergeant Bell?
- 12 A. Absolutely, yes, sir.
- Q. And basically, you've been working with sex offenders your entire time as a probation officer?
- 15 A. Yes, I have.
 - Q. And you've worked with people -- when we say "sex offenders," people charged with rape of adults; is that correct? First degree sexual assault under Rhode Island law?
 - A. Yes. Any kind of crime.
- Q. Okay. Would that include working with people who had been convicted of child pornography offenses?
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. And so you're familiar with the laws that govern sexual assault and child pornography; is that right?

A. Yes.

- Q. Now, as you told Mr. Mann, as far as the Azov
 films, you didn't do that with anybody else, correct,
 as far as ordering Azov films? You did it all by
 yourself?
 - A. I did it all by myself.
 - **Q**. Paid for it with your credit card, correct?
 - A. Correct.
 - **Q**. And I'm not sure I understood what you were saying on direct so I might have to ask you to repeat some things here, but you bought these Azov films, is it your testimony today that you were doing research and that's why you bought the Azov films?
 - A. I never used the word "research." It's very important. I'm glad you asked that question. I did not use the word "research." For 30 years I've been compiling information and gathering information.

 Research would have been taken care of later on. Once I had the format done, I knew what I was going to do
 - within the presentation, the materials within that presentation have to be validated and that's when the research would be done.
 - **Q**. So to try again, you bought the Azov films why?
 - A. To be part of the presentation.
- Q. And approximately how many of these Azov films

- that feature nothing but naked boys, how many of those did you buy?
 - A. I think we already discussed that. I think, what did we say -- I had 21 out of 69. You can debate that if you want.
 - **Q**. Go with your number, 69.
 - A. I'll go 48. I'll go 48. And then if you want to add a couple that we mentioned earlier, that would be fine.
 - **Q**. And in addition to the Azov films, you bought other films through the Azov Films website, correct?
- 12 A. Correct.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. I think on direct examination you characterized those as coming-of-age films; is that correct?
 - A. Yes.
 - **Q**. Would it be fair to say that all of those films involved minors in one way or the other in the leading roles?
 - A. I would say in the leading role, probably, yes.
 - **Q**. And would it be fair to say that all of those films depict minors in one state or another of nudity?
 - A. I can't say all of them did, but it's a possibility, very good possibility.
 - MR. DONNELLY: If I could, Ms. Anderson, and Nisshy, if we can bring up the computer, Government's

Exhibit 21.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

- **Q**. I'd like to review the invoices with you, if I could. Mr. Silva.
- MR. DONNELLY: If we could go to page one of Government Exhibit 21, please.
 - Q. And do you remember this film?
- A. I saw it one time but --
 - Q. Why did you buy this one?
- A. This was about a youth, if I recall correctly, who was supposed to go to summer camp. And instead of going to summer camp he stayed home and he had his own little adventure about things.
- Q. We can agree that this is your first purchase from Azov Films on October 14, 2012; is that right?
- 15 A. I would say so.
- 16 **Q**. What's that?
- 17 A. I'd say yes.
- MR. DONNELLY: And if we could go to page three of this exhibit, please, Ms. Anderson.
- Q. You had a couple of cancelled orders; is that right. Mr. Silva?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. You've reviewed these invoices, right?
- 24 **A.** Hum?
- 25 Q. There were two cancelled invoices?

- A. I believe so, yeah.
- Q. And going to the next one where you actually purchased an item, this movie is called "Tom and Lola," right?
 - A. Yes.

5

6

7

8

9

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

- **Q**. And that film is about basically two kids who have a disease and are living in some kind of bubble environment; right?
- A. I think that's correct, yeah.
- 10 **Q**. And they appear nude throughout the whole movie; 11 is that right?
 - **A**. I think maybe so, yes.
- MR. DONNELLY: If we could go to page five, please.
 - **Q**. Would you agree with me, Mr. Silva, that you purchased -- you had several orders before you purchased your first Azov Film production?
 - A. Yes.
 - **Q**. This is one of them here. Does this particular invoice bear any videos from Azov Films?
 - A. Yes. "Barefooted" and "Capital Fellows."
- 22 **Q**. Would you characterize those films,
- "Barefooted"and "Capital Fellows" as similar to all the others we saw with large portions of those videos being of naked boys?

- 1 **A**. Yes.
- 2 **Q**. The other films that appear here, you've heard
- 3 Mr. Mann asking some of the law enforcement witnesses
- 4 about the concept of child erotica?
 - A. Yes.

- 6 Q. Would you characterize some of these other
- 7 purchases you made, "Tender Cousins," "Les Diables,"
- 8 "Daydreams of Youth," would you characterize some of
- 9 those as child erotica?
- 10 A. Absolutely not, no. That would not be my
- 11 definition.
- MR. DONNELLY: Could we go to page 7, please.
- 13 Q. Now, on November 11, 2010, you made purchase of a
- 14 movie called "ATV Adventure," right?
- 15 **A**. Right.
- 16 Q. And that's an Azov film?
- 17 **A**. Yes, it is.
- 18 Q. Why did you purchase this particular film, video?
- 19 A. Whatever was in that particular video at that time
- 20 I thought would be consistent with the possibility of
- 21 being in the presentation, I'm sure.
- 22 **Q**. What was it that was in there that you would think
- would be good for the presentation?
- 24 A. I haven't memorized all these films. Most of them
- 25 I've seen one time and fast-forwarded through them so

- I'm not sure -- again, this would be the different
 films that were going to be in the presentation. It
 changed several times.
 - **Q**. And on this particular one, can we agree that you paid extra to get the photo DVD?
 - A. Yes, it is.
 - **Q**. Right there?

- A. Yes, right there. Yes. Yep.
- Q. That was on November 11th, Veterans Day.
- MR. DONNELLY: Can we go to page eight, the next page, please.
- And on this date, two weeks later, can we agree that you bought at least two more Azov films?

 Referring you to the first one listed, "FKK
 Waterlogged." We watched that one, so you remember that one, right?
- A. Is that the one we had here? I don't know the names --
- Q. You know it was, Mr. Silva.
 - A. Don't tell me what I know. I didn't memorize the different ones by the different names. If we showed it here, I'm fine with that. I'm not challenging anything on that. The "Freedom of Summer" and "The Climber" also I believe are Azov films.
- Q. You remember the video with the boy massaging the

- 1 other boy with oil on his back?
 - A. That's fine. Yeah. Sure.
- 3 Q. Okay. And now, how come you purchased "FKK
- 4 Waterlogged" on this date?
- 5 A. On that particular date?
- 6 **Q**. Yeah.

- 7 A. It says it was a Black Friday sale. I'm sure it was on sale.
- 9 **Q**. But why that particular video?
- 10 A. It was probably on sale.
- 11 **Q**. Does the fact that when you read in the write-up
 12 on that it talked about how one was a masseuse and
- 13 | would --

- 14 A. I don't think that was the overriding factor, no.
 - Q. You bought a second Azov DVD on this day, correct?
- 16 A. The "Freedom of Summer." Talking about the Azov,
 17 yes.
- 18 Q. How about "Scenes from Crimea, Volume 6"?
- 19 A. Oh, yes. I'm sorry. Correct. I didn't see that one.
- 21 **Q**. If you bought an Azov film for your presentation,
- 22 "FKK Waterlogged," why did you buy "Scenes from Crimea,
- 23 | Volume 6"?
- A. When I'm doing a presentation, I don't have
- exactly in mind exactly what film is going to fit in

one place. Like you, but in a different manner, I intended to crop these films. My take on things is, is that if you have this many films and you use this much of the film, that's probably what's going to happen in a presentation. If you want my perspective on it, my thinking was this, whether you want to believe it or not, is I know that when things are cropped that they take up a lot less space than the entire presentation.

For example, if you have a National Geographic spread in the magazine, you have five pictures. Those five pictures come from, according to the documentary I saw, from 10,000 to 50,000 pictures and you get those five pictures.

I was taking elements from each one of these particular films. I didn't know what they were all about until I got them. I knew they were on sale. I knew they were cheap enough to buy them for what I was willing to do, and I was going to take parts of each one or none from some of these things. I did not have the entire sequence figured out at that point. We were at the very preliminary stage of this presentation. You're asking me to give you a final product. I didn't have the final product as I mentioned over and over again. We were in the preliminary phase of the presentation.

At some point in time, yes.

presentation?

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Okay. And what films from October 2010 until the Q. present day have you cropped for your presentation?
- I hadn't cropped those particular ones because I was trying to get the other films in, actually one film that I couldn't even get in was the "Nattelek," we didn't show the entire presentation but there was one that was a commercial film called "Nattelek," or something to that effect. I couldn't get that into the I'm not good with computers. When I had time during that very busy year that I was working at work, I was very dedicated to the issues that were going on there, I would periodically stop and try and get something going on in this presentation.

The one thing I was trying to get in was the "Nattelek" film. I could not get that film into that There was no way I could get any other films into that computer at that time without getting that I also had set aside some films in a sequence that I had wanted to get in there and that sequence has been lost since the films were taken. So you interrupted the process and then you want me to give

- you the finished product. I don't think -- I obviously cannot do that.
 - Q. Are you saying "you" to me?

- A. No. I'm saying the Government. Not you personally. I apologize. I'm not saying you personally. They came in. They interfered with the process that I was in.
 - **Q**. The Government by executing a search warrant and arresting you interrupted the process of your editing and cropping; is that correct?
 - A. Of the entire presentation, not just that.
 - **Q**. Okay. Can we agree that the answer to my question two of the questions ago to how much cropping did you do is none?
 - A. I wouldn't say that's fair. I did do some cropping on the different films but they weren't cropped out of the film. In other words, I identified certain sections of certain films that were going to be cropped for the purpose of being in the presentation. They weren't cropped out of the film, which is what I thought you were talking about, onto the presentation or to any place else because I am not that computer literate. I couldn't even get the "Nattelek" film into the computer. Had I got the "Nattelek" film into the computer, there's a very good possibility a good number

- of those films would have already been into the presentation.
 - **Q**. So the fact that you couldn't copy -- you were just trying to copy a film onto your computer?
 - A. That's what I was trying to do.

- Q. The fact that you couldn't do that prevented you from trying the process on all the other DVDs?
 - A. How could I process the others? I couldn't get the first one in.
- **Q**. "Chronicle of a Boy Alone," this non-Azov film, what is that about?
 - A. I'm not sure. I can't remember all these films.

 It's been over a year or two ago since I've seen that one.
 - **Q**. Did you buy that one because it had a lengthy nude skinny-dipping scene by many boys?
 - A. Oh, no. No. That's the one where the kid was in like a reform school or something like that. That was more about the trauma experienced by the kid, not anything about -- I'm not as intense about nudity as you are.
 - Q. Okay. On November 25th, Mr. Silva, we've purchased "Barefooted," "Capital Fellows," talking about up to November 25, "ATV Adventure," "FKK Waterlogged" and "Scenes from Crimea, Volume 6."

- MR. DONNELLY: If we could go to page nine of Government Exhibit 21.
 - Q. Approximately a week later on Thursday, December 2nd, 2010, you purchased at least two more Azov films, correct?
 - A. Yes.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

15

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- **Q**. "Vladik Remembered, Volume 1, Two-Disk Set." You remember seeing that one in the courtroom, right?
- A. Yes, I did.
 - Q. And "After-School Break"?
- 11 A. Um-hum. (Affirmative.)
- 12 Q. We didn't see "After-School Break," right?
- 13 A. No, we didn't.
- 14 Q. That's about naked boys, too, I assume?
 - A. All the Azov films were about naked boys.
- 16 **Q**. After buying those first five films, why did you need to buy "Vladik Remembered, Volume 1"?
 - A. "Vladik Remembered, Volume 1" I think is an extremely important film because that kid is dead. And part of the presentation was going to be a number of scenes about this particular young man and now he's dead. I think that had an important part in the presentation. I don't know which section that was going to be in because again I had a long thing here, but I knew I wanted to fit that in?

- Q. Are you testifying that you knew he was dead when you ordered it?
 - A. It's "Vladik Remembered," yeah. Yeah. He was dead.
 - Q. And how did you know he was dead?
- A. There was an article or -- when the write-ups orsomething, he had died in a car crash or something.
 - Q. Okay. So one of these boys is gone, right?
 - **A.** Um-hum. (Affirmative.)

- **Q**. So you wanted to purchase this video for that reason?
- A. I thought that it had an important part -- that particular one I wanted to do a special presentation on him somewhere within the context of the presentation, yes, and I wanted to reference at the end of that he has passed away. I thought it was very relevant.
- **Q**. Did you find out he was dead by visiting any other websites?
- A. By visiting any other websites? When I first went onto Azov, I didn't know what Azov was and I didn't know what it stood for so I did Google Azov, and there was two things that I recall. One said that it was a region of the Ukraine and the second one was there was a memorial book for this kid, this child. I call children kids. I apologize.

- MR. DONNELLY: Okay. Can we go to the next page, please, Kelly, page 10.
 - Q. You ordered a non-Azov film on December 5th, 2010; is that right?
 - **A.** Um-hum. (Affirmative.)
 - **Q**. "La Luna" from 1979?

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- **A.** Um-hum. (Affirmative.)
 - **Q.** What's that about?
 - A. If I recall correctly, and I don't want to be held accountable for this because it's been two or three years since I've seen this, and I've only seen it one time, I believe that was about a brother and sister who were in foster care and the brother was trying to take care of the sister.
 - **Q**. Do you remember this being in a film about a mother engaging in incest with her adolescent son?
 - A. No, I don't remember that actually.
 - MR. DONNELLY: Now, if we could go to page 11, please.
 - Q. Here we are on December 18th, and you bought at least one Azov film that day, right?
- 22 A. Correct.
 - **Q**. How many of these are Azovs?
- A. I'd say the second one, and then the next to last one.

- 1 Q. Okay. "Black Sea 2.0" and "The Angler."
- 2 A. Correct.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

22

23

24

- 3 Q. Why did you buy "Black Sea 2.0"?
- A. Simply because I was buying Azov Films. As I said before, I didn't know the content of the films until you get them. Like I said before, I was just gathering information. I was gathering DVDs. After I got the DVDs, at some point in time I would sort them out, decide where they fit into the presentation, edited
 - **Q**. And of course, you deny being sexually attracted to young boys, right, sir?
 - A. Absolutely, sir, I do. And I feel offended by that question.
 - Q. I'm sure.
 - MR. MANN: Your Honor, I ask the "I'm sure" be stricken.
 - THE COURT: I'll strike the comment.

them and put them into the presentation.

- MR. DONNELLY: If we could go to the next page, please, Ms. Anderson.
 - **Q**. And you bought Azov films on Christmas Eve,

 December 24th of 2010, less than a week after the last

 purchase, correct?
 - A. Sure.
- 25 **Q**. And are the last two the Azov films on this one?

A. Yes.

- **Q**. "Boy Fights 27 Pugilistic Pals" and "Slam Dunk," why did you buy these two videos?
- A. Well, you'd have to be at that time. You're asking me two years later or three years later how I bought those particular ones. But beginning with probably part of a sequencing or just whatever is happening or whatever activities are occurring in the film. I didn't buy any of these for any special reason other than the "Vladik" one when the boy was deceased.
- **Q**. Excuse me?
- A. I said I did not buy these for any special reason. I just bought them because they were there. You see this one was on Christmas sale. They're on sale. I buy them. The price is fine. I don't care. I buy them. Gather the information, sort it out later on. The only one I bought that had any special reason to it that I can recall was the "Vladik" one because I really thought there was a need to put some kind of a special part of the presentation regarding him.

MR. DONNELLY: Could we go to page 13, please.

- **Q**. "Puppy Dog Tails," the last one, that's an Azov film, right?
- A. Yes, it is.
- 25 Q. Lots of naked boys?

Yes, sir. 1 Α. 2 MR. DONNELLY: Could we go to page 14, please. 3 Q. New Year's Day, you bought quite a few Azov films 4 that day, right? 5 Α. Yes, I did. "Boy Fight 28," "Bucharest Holiday," "Black Sea," 6 Q. "Boys Portfolio" --7 8 Α. Um-hum. (Affirmative.) 9 Q. -- and so on. We see there, now you went to "Vladik Remembered, Volume 2," correct? 10 11 Α. Um-hum. (Affirmative.) Correct. 12 The second to last one. Q. 13 Α. Yes. 14 Q. Why did you feel the need to buy "Vladik Remembered, Volume 2"? 15 16 Α. Because, again, these films were going to be 17 I didn't know what the editing was going to 18 I hadn't got into the editing process; and when I 19 got into the editing process, this was just more 20 material for that particular part of the presentation. 21 Did you have specific purposes for your Q. 22 presentation like "Vladik Remembered, Volume 1" has this particular photo; "Vladik Remembered, Volume 2" 23 24 was going to have this particular photo? Is that why

25

you purchased these?

- A. I don't understand the concept, what you're even talking about. I've already explained why I was going to put them in there. It wasn't even going to be about Azov. I wasn't even going to mention Azov in the presentation. I was going to show the various clips that I would have edited out of the different DVDs, and I was going to reference them in accordance to the concepts that were being discussed within the presentation. And then at one point in time, whatever topic it was, and I think this is important to understand, maybe because it's my own in touch with mortality, kids die, too. And there was going to be some kind of concept in there in that presentation about the mortality of children and --
- Q. So you weren't going to use Azov in the presentation, mention Azov? Did I hear that correctly? Is that what you just said?
- A. The only way Azov was going to be mentioned in there was most likely going to be in the bibliography.

 Actually, I was going to show the introduction to it at some point as well.
- **Q**. Didn't we just look at an entire slide where 9 out of 11 or 12 of the films listed on one your slides that you created had referenced Azov?
- A. This is again where you said that was the initial

slide. Again, you want to finish a presentation. When
that slide came up, it wasn't going to say --

- Q. I don't want to finish anything, Mr. Silva.
- A. You're trying to twist things here. I'm going to keep reminding you of what the truth is. The truth of the matter is when that slide came up, it wasn't going to say Azov. It was going to say "Wrestling." It was going to say, "Bait Boy." It was going to say whatever the other topic might be. The "Azov" was not going to be there. The "Nattelek" was not going to be there. The "For a Lost Soldier" was not going to be on the screen. The topic was going to be on the screen.

That was a reference for me when it came time to edit those films into that particular concept that I would be using an Azov film or I'd be using a commercial film.

- Q. Now, despite buying all these other Azov films, the truth of the matter is, if we can go to the next page, page 15, is that on January 17th, a couple of weeks after New Year's, you bought two more Azov films, right?
- A. Correct.

- Q. And in fact, one of them was one we saw here,
 "Paul and Calin's Home Video," right, remember that?
- **A.** Um-hum. (Affirmative.)

Q. And on this occasion for the second time, you bought the bonus photo DVD. Do you agree with that?

A. Sure.

- Q. And why did you buy the bonus photo DVD that day?
- A. It was probably cheap. Because it was cheaper to buy it that way. And I wasn't sure if I was going to be using action video throughout the presentation. There was possibly going to be an opportunity to show some individual slides as well. I didn't have that down pat. It was cheap enough. It was part of a package deal. It went along with it. I thought it was
- **Q**. Did you buy it because it gave you a still image of these naked boys sitting with their legs splayed and their genitals prominently featured?
- A. No. I didn't buy it for that reason.

reasonable, and I bought it.

- **Q**. Did you have particular reasons as to the videos that are listed there, why you bought those for your presentation?
- A. I was still gathering information. I hadn't got the format down.

MR. DONNELLY: The next page, please.

Q. We were just on January 17th. Five days later, January 22, you buy another Azov DVD set called "FKK Ranch," right?

A. Correct.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

19

20

21

22

23

24

- 2 **Q**. More about naked boys?
- 3 A. Sure. They're all about naked boys.
 - MR. DONNELLY: And if we could go to the next page, please, page 17. Thank you.
 - **Q**. Here we are now on February 15th of 2011, and here actually you buy nothing but Azov films, right?
 - A. Correct.
 - **Q**. Would you agree with me that pretty much from this date until you stopped buying films from azovfilms.com you bought nothing but Azov Film Productions?
 - A. I'll take your word for that.
 - Q. This is the day you bought the chicken cupcake video, right, "Cutting Room Floor"?
- 15 A. Um-hum. (Affirmative.)
- 16 Q. On this date also, referring you right here,
- 17 Mr. Silva, you bought a bonus photo DVD, correct?
- 18 A. Correct.
 - **Q**. Why did you buy the still images from that video?
 - A. As I've explained numerous times to you already, I wasn't sure if I was going to use action film or stills or both. The editing process hadn't taken place yet.
 - Q. Okay. Earlier I asked you about a movie called
 "Boy Fights 27." Here we have "Boy Fights 28" and "Boy
 Fights 2." Why did you buy those?

- A. Same answer I've given to you throughout the process. I hadn't finished the editing process, gathering information. I know when you take this much information, you break it down into that much information. The more information you have this way, the more depth you can have here, the more precise you're going to be when you edit it.
- Q. And is it your testimony to this jury -- now, we're into late February. You started buying Azov films, I think your first one was either late October or early November. We're into late February at this point, two, three, four months later, whatever it is. So you know exactly what's on these Azov films. You've watched some of the ones that you previously purchased, correct?
- **A.** Um-hum. (Affirmative.)

- Q. You know exactly what they're all about, right?
- A. When you say "watch them," a lot of them were fast-forwarded, but, yes, I have an idea what's in there, correct.
 - **Q**. Is it your testimony here today that you watched the videos the way we did in court at four-speed?
- A. I watched a good portion at least double speed.

 These things are boring as all get out, for sure.
 - Q. That's your testimony. Did you ever watch them at

regular speed?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- A. Sure did. Some of them I did. Absolutely. And then even the ones I fast-forwarded, sometimes there were parts I watched at regular speed.
 - MR. DONNELLY: Could we go to page 18, please.
- Q. And here we have two more Azov films, "Water Boys" and "The River Escape"?
 - **A**. Um-hum. (Affirmative.)
 - **Q**. That's on February 25?
- **A**. Um-hum. (Affirmative.)
- Q. And I'm going to assume that there's no particularized reason why you bought those.
 - A. Just gathering the information, to see what we can come up with so we can put it in the presentation.
 - Q. And as we've talked about, you've watched these films as they've come in. Not all of them, but --
 - A. That's not true. Yes.
 - Q. Not all of them, but you've watched them. You know what's on them. You know what they're about.
 - A. I watched some of them, yes, that's correct.

THE COURT: One at a time.

MR. DONNELLY: I'm sorry.

Q. Are you testifying today that you were gathering different bits of information as you went from "Boy Fights 22" to "Boy Fights 23" or whatever it is, after

- you watched those, did you say, "I got two different things out of that movie"?
 - A. I hadn't watched them all, as you know.
 - **Q**. Did you get it out of any of them?
- A. Say what you said again, because I'm not even surewhat you're talking about anymore.
 - **Q**. You keep saying that you bought these because each one you were going to use the information from those DVDs.
 - A. No. No. No. If you want to go back, we'll check. I said either it was use some information from these; I may have used none of the information from some of these films. I did not know the exact content of it. You're assuming I got these, I opened them and watched them right away. There were 13 left, as we talked about, that I hadn't watched plus some others in sleeves.
 - **Q**. Thirteen unopened that you didn't watch, right?
- 19 **A**. Right.

4

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

- **Q**. How many were opened?
- 21 A. The rest of them --
- 22 **Q**. Forty something, right?
- A. Well, whatever. It wasn't 40 something. Are you talking about Azov or are you talking all the films?
- 25 Q. Just Azov films.

- 1 Α. If you take 13 away from 48, it's not forty 2 something.
 - Q. Okay. I apologize. Whatever your number is, it's enough.
 - It's enough. It's plenty. Α.

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. And you're watching some of these as they come in, 7 right?
 - I'm watching some of them, but you're assuming I'm watching them all as they come in. Some of them would just go in a pile until later on when I had the opportunity to edit them. And you're assuming that I've watched every one of these when they came in and that is absolutely false.
 - Q. I'm just trying to give us one example of a piece of information that's different from one of these videos to the other that would help you in your presentation.
 - We didn't know what that was until the presentation was --
 - One of the reasons you don't know what it was is Q. these kids are speaking Romanian, right?
 - Α. There are some subtitles to it, just so you know. As a matter of fact, the dialogue was very promising in it where they had the interview process where the kids were saying their mothers were aware of what they were

1 doing. You had subtitles there? 2 Q. 3 Α. Yep. We had subtitles. We saw that. 4 Q. Were there subtitles anywhere else in these 5 videos? Α. 6 Yes, there were. 7 MR. DONNELLY: We're almost done with this. So 8 if we could just go to the next page, please. 9 Q. And here, on March 7th, you buy "Raw Rewind," 10 correct? Α. 11 Correct. 12 And we saw some of that, I think? Q. Yes. I believe we did. 13 Α. 14 Q. And "Boy Fights 26"? 15 Α. (Affirmative.) Um-hum. 16 Q. Did that give you any different information than 17 all the other "Boy Fights" or any of these other Azov films? 18 19 Once I became committed Α. The answer is the same. 20 to using Azov films in the presentation, I began to buy

Azov films. As you saw, I bought the coming-of-age

practice, the coming-of-age films. And then when I

committed myself to using the Azov films within the

films first. They were more informative to me,

educational to me, and I used those in my work

21

22

23

24

presentation, I started buying the Azov films. Ι didn't know the exact content. I was buying as many I felt that was practical, which was I overbought. minute I overbought -- I overbuy everything so this is not new in my life. I had not edited them. I had not seen them when they came in. They went in a pile for the most part. Eventually, I was going to get to the point where I could edit them all, come up with the story line that I wanted to, come up with the exact films that I wanted to for the exact concepts, run my presentation, and then I was going to put them into the presentation and they would have flowed. There would be no discussion about this. You'd see exactly how they fit into the presentation in what I think would have been a phenomenal event.

MR. DONNELLY: One moment, please, your Honor.
THE COURT: Yes.

(Pause.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- **Q**. Now, you mentioned about how you didn't -- you weren't going to buy the Internet, access to the Internet?
- A. That's correct.
- **Q**. You're single, correct?
- A. That's correct.
- 25 Q. Do you have any children?

- 1 A. No, I do not.
- 2 **Q**. So living alone at this house, right -- is it your
- 3 parents' house or something like that, or is that your
- 4 house?

- 5 A. It's my house.
- 6 Q. Okay. What I meant is did it come from family?
- 7 A. I bought it.
 - Q. And was there a reason why you didn't buy Internet access?
- 10 A. I think Internet should be free.
- 11 Q. Okay. And so in fact, when you said you told
- 12 Detective Bell in the e-mail you sent him "I have a
- 13 weak wi-fi signal sometimes" --
- 14 A. No. I said lost my wi-fi.
- 15 Q. "I lost my wi-fi." And you would sit in your
- house, and you had a wi-fi signal that you were able to
- 17 get onto, correct?
- 18 A. That's correct.
- 19 Q. And you know today whose wi-fi signal that was,
- 20 right?
- 21 A. They claim it was a neighbor's, but, you know,
- 22 that name never came up on my --
- 23 Q. Do you know the neighbor?
- 24 A. I know him. Yes, I do.
- 25 Q. Mr. Ritchotte, I think is his name?

1 A. I just call him Al.

- **Q**. Did you know the IP address on your orders from Azov went to his wireless router?
- A. I absolutely did not know that. The day that Mr. O'Connor told me I had used the neighbor's wi-fi, I told him that I did not know that I had done that because it never showed up in my -- I don't know computers, but I had never seen anything saying that I was using his. I'm not saying it didn't happen, but it was a shock to me when he told me it was my neighbor's.
- **Q**. Whose wi-fi did you think you were using while you sat at home?
- A. Ironically, there was a Tim Horton's at the end of the street. I don't know how wi-fi works, but when I went to Starbucks and I used theirs, that was actually in West Warwick, when I came home it was still on my computer and it said Starbucks on it.

And the only thing I could figure since wi-fi I don't think goes that far, down at the end of my -- down at the end of the road a bit, there was a Tim Horton's. And the Tim Horton's had a wi-fi. So I said, well, they must be using the same signal as the other guys. I don't know anything about wi-fi except you can go there and get it for free. On my computer it still said Starbucks. On the left-hand side it said

Starbucks. I figured I was getting it from Tim

Horton's. Okay? That's what I thought. They came in

and said, Nope, you're not getting it from there;

you're getting it from your neighbor. And I was

startled. I absolutely was startled. I swear to God I

But like I said, when I open my computer it has a radar, it goes out, it picks up the closest wi-fi signal.

- **Q**. And it asks you if you want to connect to a certain network, right?
- A. It connects automatically.

did not know it was his signal.

- Q. But you knew you were getting Internet from somewhere else besides your own house, right?
 - A. Yeah. I didn't have anything in my house, yeah.
 - **Q**. And you certainly had never gone to your neighbor and asked for his authorization?
 - A. I absolutely did not. Nope. Didn't even know I was using his. How could I ask?
 - **Q**. Now, in your June 3rd e-mail to Sergeant Bell, you congratulated him for taking the Azov Films website down, right?
 - A. Yes, I did.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Now, when did you first become aware that the website was down?

- A. When I went back to look for it the second time at Starbucks. I lost it at the house. I lost my wi-fi.
- I lost everything. It wasn't just them. And then to
- 4 -- I was going to get the wi-fi. I was not going to
- 5 get the Internet. Then after I sent the alleged doc to
- 6 Sergeant Bell, I went to Starbucks at some point later
- 7 on. They weren't there. They had that screen that was
- 8 mentioned earlier about something, error or something.
- 9 And I figured maybe there was something going on behind
- 10 the scenes, and maybe they did take them down and maybe
- 11 | Sergeant Bell had something to do with it.
- 12 Q. And so your reason for not buying your own
- 13 Internet access and using others, you said you think it
- 14 should be free?

2

- 15 A. It's supposed to be, yeah.
- 16 **Q**. And that had nothing to do with trying to conceal
- 17 your own activity from anybody else?
- 18 A. I didn't conceal my activity from anybody else.
- 19 **Q**. Because you made a big statement on direct
- 20 examination how you want everybody to know exactly
- 21 where you went on the Internet.
- 22 A. Absolutely.
- 23 **Q**. But if anybody -- you know about Internet protocol
- 24 addresses and how they go to a geographical address,
- 25 correct?

- A. No. I don't know. I don't know any of that stuff. Don't say I know that stuff.
- **Q**. Well, I'm asking you. Is it your testimony you don't know about that?

THE COURT: One at a time. One at a time.

- A. All I know is -- all I know is there's a wi-fi signal out there. You can pick it up for free. I don't know anything about all this other stuff you're talking about.
- **Q**. And you're a state probation officer working with child sex offenders, correct?
- **A.** Yes, I am.

- Q. Who have computer issues, correct?
- 14 A. I don't deal with computer issues. Sergeant Bell
 15 has already dealt with that.
 - **Q**. You help enforce or notify the police if there's a violation of the court's conditions about computer use by your clients, right?
 - A. No. That's done by ICAC. Sergeant Bell is very clear that it's ICAC that does the computers.
 - Probation officers do not.
 - **Q**. So if you do a home visit just to see if somebody is there, not for computer reasons, and you see that one of your clients has child pornography up on his computer, you don't notify anybody?

- A. Well, if that had happened, yes, I would have.
- 2 MR. DONNELLY: Could we bring up Government
- 3 Exhibit 30, please, page one.
- 4 Q. And this is your -- I know it's hard to read here.
- 5 You recognize this as being your e-mail to Mr. Bell?
- 6 **A**. Yes.

- 7 Q. And would it be fair to say here that in this
- 8 e-mail of May 12th, 2011, you're trying to explain to
- 9 Ken Bell that Azov is a bad website?
- 10 A. I didn't say Azov was a bad site. That's a false
- 11 statement. I'm saying it is not a bad site. I'm not
- 12 even saying that the Boy Joy is a bad website. I'm
- saying you don't connect the two. Naturism does not
- 14 link into adult pornography. If the Boy Joy site had
- not been linked into the Azov site, if it had just
- 16 cropped up somewhere else, I would never have known
- 17 about it; I would never have had a problem with the
- 18 situation.
- 19 Q. And Boy Joy is all male pornography --
- 20 A. What I saw was all male.
- 21 Q. -- that depicts graphic sexual acts?
- 22 A. It's adult pornography.
- Q. Were you ever concerned about that, that that
- 24 might violate the obscenity laws?
- 25 A. No. That was adult. It was adult. Because I've

dealt with the barely legal stuff when we did some of
the investigations with ICAC before. These kids had
the barely legal 18-year-olds. There's another site

that I mentioned in the presentation that we didn't

show you. I don't think I'll mention it, but there's

another site that the guy was on this was very similar

to that. I know it's legal because we weren't able to

prosecute on barely legal 18. If they're 18, they're

18. That's the way it goes.

- MR. DONNELLY: Can you blow up the second paragraph, the one that begins "FYI." The next two paragraphs will be fine.
- Q. Now, here you're saying, "I'm not saying Azov" -you just testified that you said, "I wasn't trying to
 tell them Azov was a bad website," but then you go on
 to tell him that "They claim to be European naturists;
 however, it's all of nude boys."
- A. Correct.

- **Q**. That bothered you?
- A. It bothered me in the sense that I said early -- I've already answered this -- as I said earlier, what bothered me was is that I had no problem with Azov before Boy Joy showed up. When the Boy Joy showed up, it gave me a different perspective on what was happening with these boys. There's nothing in Azov

that was illegal or immoral or anything else like that. It was fine. My concern was now the emphasis was on boys, and they said in the advertisement where it was for the Boy Joy that some, not all the boys that were in Azov, were in the adult films but some had -- I don't want to say graduated, but moved into the adult films that were also represented in Azov.

So that was my concern is now it's not -- I mean, the big question was going to come up is, is it illegal for you to groom -- and I don't know the answer to this -- a child to do something as an adult. That's up for -- that's a major discussion. I don't know.

- Q. Mr. Silva, is it your testimony here today that you weren't trying to cover your tracks with this e-mail, right?
- A. This e-mail was private to Sergeant Bell. I even said this had nothing to do with anything.
- **Q**. What do you mean "private"?
- A. What I'm saying is I only communicate with him. I work in a very, very dark field. You don't know what goes on out there. You don't know the things that I've dealt with. I have dealt with the darkest part of society no one wants to go into.

MR. DONNELLY: Your Honor, could the witness be directed to answer the question without lecturing.

THE COURT: Time out here a second.

So just answer the questions that you're asked.

THE WITNESS: Okay. I'm sorry, your Honor.

THE COURT: Reask your question.

THE WITNESS: Thank you, your Honor.

MR. DONNELLY: Could I have it read back.

(Pending question read by the reporter.)

A. To directly answer, as you recall, the first e-mail I sent I wanted to make sure went directly to him. He's my confidant. He's the person I trust most when it comes to certain issues in my life. Sergeant Bell is one of the most fantastic human beings I've ever seen in my life, the most top professional people. I trust him. I need someone that I can confide in. I can't live in a bubble.

I could not do anything about these particular films. I had no idea what to do about them. If there was something going on behind the scenes with these kids, I had no way of addressing it. I cleared my conscience by saying, well -- it's probably a selfish thing, but I really believed if anybody could do anything about it, it would be Sergeant Bell. He's a top pro. I sent the information to him. I stated what my concerns were. I stated very clearly that I don't want to get sued. I don't want anybody saying that I

- said this. There's nothing wrong with Azov. There's nothing wrong with Boy Joy, but when you connect the two I have concerns there might be a grooming process that's taking place where these boys are being groomed to be in the adult films, which I'm not sure is -- that's flirting with the line. I was concerned if they're doing that, if they're now transformed into these adults films --
- **Q.** Mr. Silva, I was just asking you what you meant by the word "private."
- A. I'm just saying. Okay.
- 12 **Q**. Now, you had this great relationship with Ken Bell. correct?
- 14 A. He's a great guy.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

18

- 15 Q. And you didn't confide in him.
- MR. DONNELLY: Could we see the whole page again.
 - Q. You didn't confide in him that you had purchased Azov products, correct?
- 20 A. It had nothing to do with it.
- 21 **Q**. Why wouldn't you tell him that?
- 22 A. Why would I?
- Q. You didn't tell him you spend \$1,589 at that website.
- 25 A. Why is that his business? I had no problem with

the Azov site itself.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. You can tell from this e-mail you had no problems.
- Α. Excuse me. You keep trying to twist -- I have a feeling you keep trying to twist things away from the truth of the matter. The truth of the matter is I had no problem with the Azov site, and I had no problem with the Boy Joy site. I had a problem with linking the two. If somebody bought Azov, fine. If somebody bought Boy Joy, fine. They're both fine. They're non-sexual. They're fine. They are what they are. But I don't think they should be linked together. They made the link, Azov and Boy Joy did, between the two. I didn't make that link. That link is what caused me to reflect back on the Azov films, that even though those films themselves are absolutely fine, that something might be happening behind the I did not know what to do. I felt very helpless about that. I didn't know who to contact, so I contacted the person I knew had the most skill when it came to the Internet, and that was Sergeant Bell, one of the best people I've ever met in my life.
- **Q**. All right. I'd like to turn to your presentation. How many presentations have you done in your ten-year career?
- A. This is it. This was going to be the big one.

1 Q. This was the big one, right?

- A. That said, this was my legacy right here.
- Q. So you had never actually done a presentation in the ten years that you were a State of Rhode Island probation officer?
 - A. Absolutely not, nope.
 - **Q**. And you agree with the testimony of Ms. Imbriglio that you never sought permission to research this matter?
 - **A**. Absolutely not.

2

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

19

20

21

22

23

24

- **Q**. And never sought permission to get -- to make the presentation?
- A. Didn't need to do it. Didn't do it.
 - **Q.** And is it your testimony that you -- in this future big presentation, you were not going to be representing yourself as a probation officer?
- 17 A. Absolutely not. And there's a reason for that, 18 too.
 - **Q**. Did you ever speak to anybody that you worked with about the fact that you were buying these Azov films and you had this presentation in mind?
 - A. I didn't speak to anything about buying Azov films, but people would constantly say to me, You need to go back to private practice part-time, you need to teach at a university, you need to write a book. I

- didn't say that. This came from other people. Whether 2 you want to believe it or not, that's a fact.
 - Q. Did you ever --

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

- Α. And periodically I would say to the people -- you asked the question. Periodically I would say to the folks is that I'm not going to do those things. I want to do something on a grander scale. I have this dynamite presentation that I should be working on but I'm not. I need to motivate myself. I don't want to do things on an individual basis, small scale anymore. I want to get it all out there so I can do my mea culpa of the information I have so that I can get on with my life so I can travel and I can be happy again. what it was about.
- Q. Okay.
 - I keep saying it over and over again to you. Α.
- Q. And so the answer to the question of if I asked you did you tell anybody in the Department of Corrections that you were working on this big
- 20 presentation, the answer is?
- 21 Α. No.
- 22 Q. Okay. You had a direct supervisor, Jean Embrey.
- 23 Did you tell her?
- 24 Α. Absolutely not, no.
- 25 Q. And do you agree with Mr. Psyllos, who was here,

- who said your PowerPoint was created in July of 2011?

 No reason to dispute that?
 - A. I have no reason to dispute that. The film version of it, yes. Not the part that was on paper, of course.
 - Q. What do you mean "the film version"?

- A. Well, in other words, I didn't just sit there that day and put it on the PowerPoint. I had prepared the information to put into the PowerPoint. I didn't just PowerPoint it. I got the PowerPoint when I felt I had enough material to start the PowerPoint presentation to put it on I call it film. You know, onto the slides.
- Q. Did you do any actual research for this presentation?
- A. I don't want to use the word "research." I had been gathering information for 30 years. Actually, probably 40 if you want to count the times when I was a scout leader. Constantly gathering articles, "Dateline" things, "60 Minutes." I had boxes of videos from different programs, different stories related to the development and protection of children. So the research I would say is a false word to use, not an accurate word. Research would come in --
- Q. When you say "false," you mean when you said that to Inspector --

A. I'll say this. I was not doing research.

- **Q**. Let me ask the question. When you told Inspector Connelly you were doing research for a presentation for work --
- A. Oh, no. That's a false statement right there. I did not say I was doing research for work. What I said was I was gathering information. I'm very careful about using that word "research" because it's not something I had done yet. I was gathering information for a presentation for law enforcement, CPIs. I never said I was using it for work because there's a good possibility I was never going to use it for work. I was going to either use it under my license, I can use it under my own name.

I can't say I was never going to tell DOC about it, but I didn't have to notify them about it until I had a presentation and I had to notify them ten days before that.

But when you mentioned the word "research," which you seem to be kind of hung up on, when I got to the research phase of this, I was going to have to hire an intern to assist with this, because I do not know how to do that effectively. What would take me a year to find on the Internet would probably take an intern a few minutes. So I was actually going to spend more

money on this rather than the Azov films. 1 2 And then I was also going to put on --3 THE COURT: Wait. Let Mr. Donnelly ask another 4 question. 5 THE WITNESS: Thank you, your Honor. I have a tendency -- I'm just irritated. 6 7 We can agree that you didn't do any scholarly Q. 8 research for this, correct? 9 Α. Scholarly research in saying the information I had 10 might be scholarly, but I didn't go back and verify to see if that information was still valid. 11 12 Scholarly meaning reading from experts in the Q. 13 field, that sort of thing. 14 Α. Definitely. I've been to many, many seminars. 15 Those seminars have many, many documents that you get 16 from them. So yes, it has scholarly information. 17 Q. The documents you mentioned were "Dateline," "60 18 Minutes," that kind of thing? 19 There's so much stuff that I had. I didn't Α. 20 mention it all, but yes, I've been to numerous 21 seminars. We said that earlier in the interviews and 22 this conversation here that I happened to have here, 23 that part of that was I've been to a lot of trainings. 24 From those trainings you get materials. I had boxes of

those materials. It was not sorted out. That was

going to be part of the sorting process. When you use that information from the previous trainings, you have to document where you got the information but you also have to research to see if that information is still relevant. I had not got to the research phase.

MR. DONNELLY: Your Honor, we have an electronic copy of Defendant's Exhibit D, if we can bring it up.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. DONNELLY: Ms. Anderson -- we've covered some of these slides -- if we could go to Slide 12, I think it would be. And go to the slide show, if we could.

- Q. Now, this was your slide, your words, right?
- A. Um-hum. (Affirmative.)

- **Q**. And were you trying to sort of bring the sort of nudist/naturist philosophy into the presentation?
- A. I would imagine there's a subtle part of that, but I was really addressing the fear that we have about nudity.

MR. DONNELLY: Next slide, please.

One moment, please.

Q. And "The natural state of the child is..." the next slide is, this is the picture you told us about, you chose this to show us -- you wanted to start a discussion about nudity of children?

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Α. Initially it's a statement of fact that that gets the shock effect going. I've already done this to other people; and even in trainings I've said, well, you know the natural state of a child is nude. always like when you talk about nudity in our world it's like you got to shut down, close your eyes, you know, hear, see no evil, that kind of stuff. to understand that's the natural state of a child. impose adult standards on children. When we look at children and we see things, we put our standards onto them, and we say you should be clothed when a kid says -- we condition them to make our comfort level. The bad guys understand the natural state of a child is nude. Okay? And they will use that against us if we're not aware of that.

If we make nudity evil, and it may have some underpinnings of naturism because I know how it's not dangerous, then we make our children more vulnerable to these bad guys. Clothing does not protect a child. You've got to very much understand that. It does not. We do not protect our children simply because they're wearing clothes.

MR. DONNELLY: Could we go to Slide 26, please.

Mr. Mann, I think this slide had some extensive notes. Do you need the notes brought up?

1 MR. MANN: I'd defer to the Government.

- Q. I wanted to ask you -- you recall this slide,
- 3 Mr. Silva?

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. Yes, I do.
 - Q. The second bulleted point says, "If the perpetrator's manipulations fail, he will simply take the child and if this means killing the entire family"?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. Is that part of your research?
 - A. That was an article that came -- or a news program that was on TV about a guy who came across state lines. He was traveling past a home. He saw the children playing in their bathing suits in front of the house, became obsessed with them. He waited until nighttime. He went in and shot the entire family.

Sorry. This is not for you. Okay? I'm sorry, but this -- you know, shot the entire family. Took the boy, took the girl, had sex with the boy, didn't like it, killed the boy and kept the girl.

- Q. And where did that take place?
- A. Out the West Coast somewhere. I had to research that and get that article back up.
 - MR. DONNELLY: Could we go to Slide 30, please.
- Q. You recall this slide, your testimony on this?
- 25 **A.** Sure.

- **Q**. Are you referring here -- each time it says "Azov" in this bulleted list, were you referring to a particular Azov film?
- A. At one time I had particular films listed in there. Like you have the "Egor" one in there, I had different ones in there. It kept changing, kept changing. So I didn't have the flow that I wanted to so I just took it all out and put "Azov" in there.

When it came up, this is what you asked earlier, when it came up all you would see is "Caretaking, Selecting a Victim, Starting Them Young, Bait Boy, Wrestling" and so forth. All these other things would not have been there. Even like "Live" wouldn't have been there and "Nattelek" at the top wouldn't have been there.

- **Q**. And you created this PowerPoint in July of 2011, some time after you found out that the Azov website was down?
- A. Correct.

- **Q**. And it would be testimony today you didn't create the PowerPoint again just to cover your tracks about your purchases from Azov?
- A. The PowerPoint was not used to cover any tracks.

 I had no tracks to cover.
 - MR. DONNELLY: Can we go to Slide 32, please.

- Q. This is one we did not explore on direct examination. You recall this slide, right?
 - A. Yes, I do.

okay, this --

what the question was.

3

4

7

11

13

18

19

- **Q**. These are your words?
- 5 A. I wrote those down, yeah. They're not my words.
- 6 These are the sites that I went to, yeah.
 - **Q**. These are sites you went to?
- A. When you talk about research, this is part of the research, if you want to call it. On the site Twinks,

 T-W-I-N-K-S, the one I was not going to tell you about,
- 12 THE COURT: I think the question was -- I forgot
- 14 Could you read the question back.
- (Pending question read by the reporter.)
- THE COURT: So are those your words? That was the question, are those your words?
 - A. What do you mean by "my words"?
 - **Q**. Well, who typed up this slide?
- 20 A. I typed them up.
- Q. And you went to a site called "Milk Boys"?
- A. Well, I went to the site Twinks, which linked into
 Milk Boys and Boy Love News, yes.
 - Q. Okay. And what's "Twinks" about?
- 25 A. Twinks is we had done -- well, the ICAC person did

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

it, an investigation into one of our probationers and he had gone to this particular site along with some other sites. I didn't know what Twinks meant, to tell you the truth. I still don't think I really know. it was a site that I think had young men on it that were younger than 18 but because it said it was an adult, there was nothing the authorities could do about And so part of this is -- again, I'm talking to police officers, what else is out there. Well, Twinks is out there. If you want to see what real child pornography looks like -- this wasn't for you, it's for them -- this is as close as you're going to get to it is this particular site. While I was at that site, they had other things that linked in. And something that's very scary out there is your kids know about these sites. There are sites out there --

MR. DONNELLY: Your Honor, I'd --

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, your Honor.

THE COURT: Just try to focus on the questions.

THE WITNESS: I am sorry. There's so much information. I apologize. There's so much information you need to know.

THE COURT: Okay. Stop. Stop. Just listen to the questions and try to answer the questions put to you.

THE WITNESS: Thank you, your Honor. I'll try to do that.

- **Q**. Tell us about why you wrote down on this slide "Boy Love News."
- A. It was one of the links that was incorporated into the Twinks site. I had never heard of it in my entire life. I had never heard of Milk Boys. So before you ask on that, never heard of it. Very informative about this.
- Q. How frequently did you go to these websites?
- A. I know I tried to find -- a long time I tried to find Twinks because I was looking up Twinkies, which wasn't right. And I don't think I spent a lot of time on it, on any one of those.
- **Q**. Boy Love News you're quite familiar with, though, right?
- A. I'm not quite familiar with any either one of these. All I can tell you is that one of them had --there was like news bulletins on boys, and there was another one where you could -- they could link up with -- the way I guess they put it was gay boys can link up with men in your area. Don't worry about it. We got good guys out there that are going to link up with you. Something to that effect.
- Q. Did you go to Boy Love News so that you could find

- 1 news about the investigation of Azov Films? 2 Α. I did not, no. 3 Q. Did you go to Boy Love News -- you're denying that 4 you went to it quite a bit, Mr. Silva? 5 I don't know how often I went to that. I know it Α. was part of the -- I only remember going one time. 6 7 Q. Were you linked to it from a site called "Boy 8 Wickie"? Are you familiar with that site? 9 Α. I thought I came in it from Twinks. 10 Q. Are you familiar with Boy Wickie? 11 Α. I am not familiar with Boy Wickie. 12 Or other boy-lover websites? Q. 13 Α. I'm not familiar with them, no. 14 Q. Would you deny that you went to the Boy Love News 15 website some 28 times? 16 Α. I would say that would be most -- if it's there, 17 it's there, but if I went to Boy Love News that many 18 times, it would have to be while I was looking for 19 Twinks. 20 MR. DONNELLY: Could I have one moment, please,
- 21 your Honor.

22 THE COURT: Yes. 23 (Pause.)

24

25

Now, several times on direct you said, Mr. Silva, Q. that the Azov films were perfectly legal and naturist

- 1 or nudist films; correct?
- 2 A. Correct.
- Q. And can we agree that in the films that form the
- 4 charged videos in this case, that those films -- we
- 5 don't see any families, correct?
- 6 A. Correct.
- 7 **Q**. We don't see any moms?
- 8 A. Correct.
- 9 Q. We don't see any dads?
- 10 A. Correct.
- 11 Q. We don't see any sisters?
- 12 A. That's correct.
- 13 Q. We don't even see any organized sporting activity,
- right? We don't see volleyball, baseball?
- 15 A. No, there are some of them that do. Some of the
- 16 films did have organized sports and activities. The
- 17 ones you showed --
- 18 Q. Not much, right?
- 19 **A**. Huh?
- 20 **Q.** Not much?
- 21 A. Not in the ones you showed.
- 22 **Q**. How about the ones your own lawyer showed?
- 23 A. Which ones were they? The ones he showed --
- 24 Q. He showed them all.
- 25 A. Those are the ones that you had, right? My lawyer

the same as all the other naturist films. They don't

The

have a plot either. I mean, they have a theme.

24

1 theme is a naturist lifestyle. 2 MR. DONNELLY: Nothing further. 3 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Donnelly. 4 Mr. Mann, do you have some cross-examination? 5 MR. MANN: A little bit, yes. THE COURT: How long do you expect? 6 MR. MANN: Five, ten minutes? 7 Maybe not even 8 that long. 9 THE COURT: That's fine. Come on up. 10 Ladies and gentlemen, you know that I had you order lunch because I was not sure about whether we 11 12 would be getting the case to you for deliberations before lunch or after, and it's obvious that we're 13 14 going to get the case to you after lunch. 15 So your lunch is waiting for you in the jury 16 I want to complete the examination of the 17 witness before you have your lunch. We'll probably 18 have a shortened lunch hour since we bought the lunch 19 We'll shorten the lunch hour and then come for you. 20 back and do what we need to do after lunch. All right? 21 Go ahead, Mr. Mann. 22 REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. MANN 23 In the cross-examination, there was reference to a **Q** . 24 film called "Nattelek," or something?

25

Α.

"Nattelek," yes.

Q. That's referenced to the PowerPoint, right? What is that?

A. It's a commercial film. That film was going to be used to demonstrate -- there aren't that many female sex offenders, the theory being is that adult female sex offenders use caretaking as the mechanism for molesting children. In this particular film, there is no molestation of the child, just so you know, but there was a caretaking scene that you could see was very representative if a person wanted to cross the line they could have crossed the line and very easily seduced the young man that was in the film.

It was very well done and very representative of how if a woman wanted to, because we're always talking about guys, have to talk about women sometimes, if a woman wanted to molest the child, this child through the caretaking process it would have been very easy to do it.

- **Q**. You were asked about what your role was as a probation officer with respect to searching computers.

 Do you remember that line of questioning, sir?
- A. Yes.

- **Q**. You were the probation officer for sex offenders, right?
- A. Yes, I was.

- Q. Did you have any authority to search a computer in your capacity as a probation officer?
 - A. No, I did not.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

20

21

22

23

24

- **Q.** If you saw something suspect on a computer that happened to be on when you walked into a house -- first, did that ever happen?
 - A. No. They don't -- if there's a knock on the door, they're turning off their computer.
 - **Q**. Did you have any authority to tell them to turn on their computer?
- 11 A. I did not.
- Q. Was there an established protocol for what you were supposed to do if you had suspicions about an offender's use of a computer?
- 15 A. I would contact ICAC.
- 16 **Q**. And ICAC was what?
- 17 A. Internet Crimes Against Children.
- 18 **Q**. And who would then conduct the search of the computer?
 - A. It would either be the state police or somebody trained by them that would go out with the probation officer. We'd actually have to get consent, just so you know. We can't just walk in and get their computer and open it up. We have to get consent.
- Q. Or if you didn't get consent, would you have to

use a sworn law enforcement official?

- A. We would have to get some kind of a warrant or something. I mean, there has to be grounds for the warrant, obviously, not just suspicion. I mean, there would have to be some --
- **Q**. You never participated in the actual search of the computer?
- A. Never in ten years.
- **Q**. I thought you started to answer a question about why you were not going to make this presentation as a probation officer. Was there a reason you were not going to make the PowerPoint presentation as a probation officer?
- A. Yes. Because whenever you have any kind of nudity or anything like that, I'm not naive, you're going to get -- you can get challenged. There are lots -- remember what I said earlier, no politically correct people? Because politically correct people have a tendency to cause difficulties when it comes to nudity in films and things like that.

I looked at DOC. I don't always like what's going on there, but I want to protect them as well. I wanted this on me, on my license or on me personally so there would be nobody else involved. If there was any kind of a challenge to these films because of the

1 nudity, then they would have to come and talk to me 2 about it. No one else would be involved. And I bought 3 these -- I said earlier, I bought these films. I put 4 in the presentation that I am solely responsible for 5 the contents of that presentation. If there's any 6 problems with it, you come talk to me. You don't talk 7 to DOC. You don't talk to anybody else. You come talk 8 to me. Here we are. 9 Q. When you used the Internet, do you know what an IP 10 address is? 11 If I'm using my computer, what that says is that Α. 12 my computer has an address to it so when I went to Azov 13 or somewhere else it would show it was on my computer. 14 Q. Did you use wi-fi in an attempt to conceal who you 15 were when you were on the computer? 16 Α. Absolutely not. 17 Q. Did you always use the same address when you used 18 your home computer, same e-mail address? 19 Α. Same e-mail address, absolutely, yeah, it's 20 gerald.silva@home. 21 MR. MANN: Nothing further. Thank you. 22 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Mann. 23 Is there any recross, Mr. Donnelly?

MR. DONNELLY: No, your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Silva, your

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

testimony is complete. You may step down. Thank you.

Counsel, would you come up for a moment.

(Sidebar conference off the record.)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, it's 12:45.

What I think we will do after consulting with

counsel -- first of all, Mr. Mann, do you have any

further witnesses?

MR. MANN: No, your Honor. Defense rests.

THE COURT: Thank you. So the defense has What we'll do at this point is we'll take our lunch hour. There's a couple things I need to take up with the attorneys that you don't need to be in the box Your lunches that you ordered are in the jury I'm sorry. I just learned that the alternates room. didn't get to order lunch so I didn't know that until a few minutes ago, and the reason for that is that often once everything is completed the alternates are discharged and so I think everyone thought that that was going to happen when they took those orders. So you're welcome to steal any other jurors' lunch that you think you can get away with, or to go out and buy something or to share. Whatever you want to do.

But I think we'll take 45 minutes. And ladies and gentlemen, you don't have to eat in the jury room across the hall. You can go downstairs. You can just

go for a walk. You can do what you want, just like you would on any other lunch hour. It's just we're going to have a short lunch hour, okay?

So 45 minutes would put us back here at 1:30.

And the reason I'm doing all of this this way is to get you this case this afternoon so you can start deliberating. That's what I'm trying to get to and I think we have a good shot at doing that. All right?

So just keep in mind all of my instructions, no discussions about the case, no deliberating until you get it for deliberation this afternoon.

Have a good lunch, 45 minutes.

(Proceedings out of the presence of the jury as follows:)

THE COURT: All right. We do have to do a couple of things on the record before we take our break. I've handed you a draft instruction that would go at the end of the section on "Knowingly" and would be placed at the top of page 12 above the definition of the word "received." That way we wouldn't have to reprint all the instructions, all the pagination would remain the same, and I would just substitute the new page 12 for the old page 12.

Do either of you have -- is that satisfactory to you?

MR. DONNELLY: Yes, your Honor, thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Mann, do you have an objection to this instruction?

MR. MANN: I absolutely do. I think that this instruction conflicts with the instructions that deal with the elements of the offense, both for Counts I through VI and Count VII. And it conflicts because what Counts I through VI require is that the defendant knowingly received a visual depiction, that the depiction involved the use of a minor engaging in sexually explicit conduct, and that he knew the depiction was of that conduct and he knew that at least one other person was a minor.

Now what this says is this. This takes away the knowledge requirement, Judge. What it says is that all the Defendant had to know was that he was seeing a visual depiction. Doesn't even say he has to see a visual depiction, but even if it did say that, it doesn't say that he had to see a visual depiction and that he knew it was of sexually explicit conduct. That's what it does, Judge. It takes away that element of the offense.

Your instruction says the Defendant did not have to know that the visual depiction was of sexually explicit conduct. And I think that the element

explicitly requires that. I think this, in fact, takes that element away.

THE COURT: Let's just be clear. What the instruction says is that the Government is not required to prove that the Defendant knew or correctly understood the law of child pornography, but only that he knew factually what he was doing, right?

MR. MANN: I think what the statute requires is --

THE COURT: So you're saying you think, I want to be clear, your position is that the Defendant's possible ignorance of the law is a defense to the crime. That's essentially what I think you're saying.

Put it this way. The Defendant has testified that he believes, he said this over and over, that there's nothing wrong with the Azov site, there's nothing wrong with the Azov films. If the jury determines that that is incorrect as a matter of fact, that is, that these are visual depictions of a lascivious nature, they're sexually explicit, right, if they determine that, then what you're saying is -- and the Government has proven that, you're saying that his misunderstanding of that is a defense.

MR. MANN: We haven't debated about whether it would have to be a reasonable misunderstanding or not

that he was seeing sexually explicit conduct.

or anything like that, but there is a mens rea requirement to this statute. And the mens rea requirement is embraced in the requirement of the knowingly requirement, Judge. And he has to have known

THE COURT: Let me just -- if the jury says this is sexually explicit and he says, well, I don't think so, I don't think it's sexually explicit, then he's not guilty because he disagrees with the jury.

MR. MANN: The Government can certainly argue that they should disbelieve the Defendant. The Government can certainly argue that all the inferences point to the contrary, that he knew he was importing sexually explicit material. They can argue all of that, but they still have to prove that he knew it was sexually explicit conduct, Judge. And I think that's an absolute defense that he has. Now, they can say that that defense is gibberish; and if you had a case, for example, where the pictures depicted young kids in explicit sexual activity, the first four list of things that are excluded by the statute, I don't think there would be much of a dispute.

I don't think a defendant could stand up here and argue I didn't know it was sexually explicit conduct if you had intercourse with a six-year-old.

case.

But you have this case and I think the Government has to prove in this case that he knew that there was sexually explicit conduct and this is a borderline

THE COURT: How does one know that?

MR. MANN: Well, the same way one knows any other state of mind of the defendant. Courts always instruct that we don't have an X-ray of the defendant's mind, something like that. You're to determine the defendant's state of mind the same way you determine any other fact by making all the reasonable inferences, considering all the testimony. So they can consider all that and they can look at what the record is and the jury can say, yes, he did know, his denials are just nonsense; or the jury can say, no, the Government didn't prove that. His simple denial isn't enough. It's all the evidence in the record.

But what this statute requires, and it's clearly in your instruction on page ten, and it's also, just so the record is absolutely clear, Judge, I think that this whole argument applies not to just Counts I through VI, Judge, but it also applies to Count VII because --

THE COURT: I agree with that.

MR. MANN: I just want to make clear that the

elements are essentially the same for I through VI and VII except that Count VII is possession and Count VI is receipt, I through VI are receipt.

And you spell out the elements for Count VII on page 18 and it's the same knowledge requirement with respect to those counts. So I just want to make that technical point.

I think that -- and part of the argument here is that if this isn't an element of this offense, then if the Government doesn't have to prove that he knew that he either received or possessed this material and that he knew it involved a visual depiction of sexually explicit conduct, if the Government didn't have to prove that, Judge, it almost becomes a strict liability law and what saves the statute in view of many of the courts that have examined it, I would submit, from a vagueness challenge is the fact that there is a mens rea requirement, mens rea requirement being the knowingly.

I think that what the proposed instruction does is take that mens rea requirement out of the statute.

I think it conflicts with the requirement of "knowingly" spelled out for all seven counts and at the very minimum so confuses the jury with conflicting instructions that they'll misunderstood what the

Government's obligation is.

I think I can make a closing argument that says

-- I think I'm absolutely entitled to make a closing

argument that says not only do you have to prove that

it was lascivious, but you have to prove that the

Defendant knew it was lascivious.

THE COURT: I disagree with that. Maybe I'm wrong about the law, but I don't think you can make that closing argument. I don't think the Government has to prove that he knew to a certainty that a jury would conclude that this was lascivious.

MR. MANN: We're verging into the next questions that I'm going to have, which are what can I say in my closing argument. Because if the Court is saying that all the Government has to prove is that in fact he downloaded these pictures, or received these pictures, I'm sorry, that he received or possessed these pictures, I'll just have to address that in my closing argument. It seems to me what the Court is saying is --

THE COURT: I guess the difference is maybe more precisely between belief and knowledge. All right?

And you're, in my view, conflating and the Defendant in his testimony has conflated belief with knowledge as if belief equals knowledge. Belief doesn't equal

knowledge. The Defendant can have a belief that is wrong. He can have a belief that is deliberately ignorant. Those beliefs don't acquit him of the charges. Knowledge is something that is objective and is factual. That's what we've been told by the cases. The jury decides factually what is sexually explicit.

Now, what you're saying is and what the Defendant seems to be saying and you want to argue is if he believed these films not to be sexually explicit that the Government has failed to prove the knowledge requirement. And I believe that is an incorrect statement of the law.

MR. MANN: I'm not saying that, though.

THE COURT: Well, that's what's coming out.

MR. MANN: I'm saying something I think is close to that, but not that. It's not what he believes. I'm saying that based on this record that the Government has to prove that he had knowledge that it was lascivious in the facts of this case and that they can try and make that argument from all the evidence in this case. They are clearly making the argument that the PowerPoint was a coverup. They're clearly making an argument that he has a predilection for young boys. That's apparent from the cross-examination, Judge. I can go on with what I anticipate some of their

arguments to be.

They can argue that his whole statement is unbelievable and that he clearly had knowledge that he was receiving or possessing lascivious material. I think just as equally clearly I should be able to argue that he didn't have knowledge that he was receiving or possessing lascivious material. And the jury is going to have to base that determination on all the facts not just on what he said. I mean, it's commonplace for the prosecution to say, "I don't believe the defendant."

But I think if the Court gives this instruction, you're saying that all the Government has to prove is in effect that he had -- that he didn't accidentally receive these packages in the mail, and he didn't accidentally receive these images. I don't think that's what the law says at all. I think this knowledge requirement says it has to be something more than by accident, mistake and other inadvertent reason --

THE COURT: Let's be clear. I struck the sentence that was in the instructions in your motion, the one sentence description that was there before, that the Government doesn't have to prove that the Defendant knew what he did was against the law. That's essentially what it said. I tried to make it more

moderate. But some instruction needs to be given, given the Defendant's testimony.

He stated over, and over, and over again that this website and these are legal. That's what he has said, and he said it about 25 times. That's in my view a statement of his belief but that's not a statement of an objective fact. That's for the jury to decide. And that's all this instruction tries to do is draw a distinction between his belief and the objective fact.

MR. MANN: This instruction says the Government is not required to prove that the Defendant knew or correctly understood the law of child pornography, only that he knew factually what he was doing.

Well, factually, the question is did he receive a package, did the package have pictures in it or images in it.

THE COURT: Well, that sentence could be taken out. It could begin with "If the Defendant incorrectly believed."

MR. MANN: If that sentence were taken out, I think I would be free to argue that the Government has to prove that he knew that the images involved the use of a minor engaging in sexually explicit conduct. And it's obviously no secret that I'm going to argue that he didn't know that.

THE COURT: Would you be satisfied with this instruction if I took the first sentence out?

MR. MANN: Could I have just a moment to think about this, Judge.

It's better without that sentence, but I still object to it because it becomes a comment on the Defendant's testimony, and there is no need for a comment on the Defendant's testimony.

The Government is free, Judge, to argue to their heart's content that they should disbelieve the Defendant. I suspect that they are going to argue that the jury should disbelieve the Defendant, Judge, but I don't think the Court should be commenting on the Defendant's testimony which the rest of this in effect is. We shouldn't be focusing on what he believes. The question is did he have knowledge. I agree knowledge is different than belief. The Government can argue that he clearly had knowledge, and I know they're going to argue that. I'm going to argue to the contrary, and that's a question of fact for the jury.

THE COURT: It's not a comment on the Defendant's testimony. I'm trying to help the jury. That's what jury instructions are supposed to do. The jury may have -- look at all the argument that's going on amongst us. The jury needs to be able to figure

this out.

Do you want to say anything, Mr. Donnelly?

MR. DONNELLY: No, your Honor. I have no
objection to the original instruction as proposed by
the Court or the one the Court just brought down.

THE COURT: All right. Well, I think you've more than placed your objection on the record. I'll think about it over the next half hour. I'm going to make a decision about what to put in there, but something needs to be said that clarifies this issue and I think that this instruction does it in a fairly simple and non-offensive way.

MR. MANN: I have another request, Judge. I want a little more time. Not much, maybe another half hour at some point before I start making the closing.

I mean, we're going to have about 20 minutes during this lunch break and then you're going to go into instructing the jury.

THE COURT: I mean, you've known you're going to close today.

MR. MANN: Oh, I knew we were going to close today, but there's a lot to respond to. We just had the Defendant on the stand for the whole morning. I'm going to juggle my closing a little bit, not much, but I'm going to juggle a little bit of what I've outlined.

THE COURT: You've got to use your lunch hour to do that. That's the best I can do for you. I'll give you a few more minutes besides the half hour since we've been arguing about this for a while, but that's what you get. I'm not going to delay it an hour. We're going to go into closings right after the instructions, which will start as soon as the evidence is completed.

Okay? We'll be in recess.

(Lunch recess.)

THE COURT: I've had the clerk hand you a new page 12 for the final instructions. So I'd ask that you substitute that page for page 12 that's in there. I've taken the first sentence out of the draft instruction I gave you previously, and I reversed the order of the sentences so that it emphasizes that it's for the jury to decide whether the material meets the definition of sexually explicit conduct and then the sentence that if the Defendant incorrectly believed what does and does not constitute child pornography that does not relieve him of responsibility so long as the Government has proven the elements I outlined above.

I've considered your objection, Mr. Mann. I think you said you thought it was commenting on the

testimony. I disagree with that. I think it's a very mild instruction given what the instructions previously were, which I took out, and given the Defendant's testimony. And I don't believe it's commenting. I think it's just clarifying. But I note your objection and I don't want to reargue it now.

MR. MANN: I understand your ruling. I'm going to have to make it when you make the final instructions. I just want -- can I get a little guidance on what I can say during my closing and not say on the knowledge point?

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. MANN: What I intend to argue or what I had intended to argue was that the Government had to prove that Mr. Silva received the visual depiction, that he knew it was sexually explicit conduct and that it involved a minor, and then I was going to argue that there were multiple reasons why the Government couldn't prove that he did this knowingly.

Now, as I read your instruction, I can still $\label{eq:make_state} \text{make that kind of argument.}$

THE COURT: I think that's fine. The only thing I think you can't do is argue that you heard Mr. Silva say he didn't believe this was child pornography or sexually explicit; so therefore, he could not have

1 knowingly --2 MR. MANN: That's not in my argument. 3 THE COURT: So I think that's where the line is, and I don't think you're making that argument. 4 5 MR. MANN: I don't think I am. I think it's a 6 I do argue that it's absurd to think that he 7 would do this given his history and all that, but I 8 think I can still make that kind of argument under your 9 instruction. THE COURT: Sure. I think that's right. 10 11 MR. MANN: Thank you. 12 THE COURT: Mr. Donnelly, do you have some 13 rebuttal? 14 MR. DONNELLY: We considered over lunch time and 15 I listened to Mr. Mann's objection to it and I 16 sustained his objection. We're ready to move forward 17 without it. 18 THE COURT: I'll leave now. 19 All right. Mr. Mann? 20 MR. MANN: At some point, I just have to renew 21 my motion. 22 THE COURT: I think given what Mr. Donnelly has 23 said, you should renew now. 24 MR. DONNELLY: The Government has no rebuttal. 25 MR. MANN: So the defense renews its motion for

a judgment of acquittal under Rule 29, and unless the Court objects, I will incorporate by reference the arguments I made at the close of the Government's case and rely on those arguments. I think the arguments are the same in support of my motion for a judgment of acquittal.

THE COURT: Okay. Very well. And I'll deny the motion for the reasons previously stated.

I think we're ready to bring the jury in.

(Proceedings in the presence of the jury as follows:)

THE COURT: Welcome back, ladies and gentlemen. I hope you enjoyed lunch. I hope our alternate jurors found lunch. And I've been discussing matters with counsel. And as you heard before lunch the Defendant rested his case, and the Government has determined that it has no rebuttal testimony so both sides have now rested and it's time for me to give you instructions on the law that will govern your deliberations and then we'll move directly to closing arguments by counsel and you'll have this case for deliberation shortly. All right?

So at this time it's my duty to instruct you on the law that is applicable to this case. You must accept the rules of law that I give to you and you must

apply them to the facts in this case as you find those facts to be.

Now, in applying the law that I'm about to explain to you in these instructions, you must consider the instructions as a whole. You should not choose one part and disregard another. You must accept and apply the law as I give it to you in its entirety.

You must accept and apply the rules of law that I give you whether you agree with them or not. It would be a violation of the oath that you took as jurors to base a decision on any version of the law other than that contained in my instructions, just as it would be a violation of that oath to return a decision based on anything other than the evidence in this case.

It is not up to you to decide what the law is or what the law should be. Your duty is to apply the law as I explain it to you.

Now, I see some of you reaching for your notebooks; and I just want to say you're free to take notes while I give these instructions, but I do want to tell you that I provide a written copy of my instructions to go into the jury room with you. So I don't want you panicking at some point while I'm saying something that's rather complex that you have to write

it all down. You'll have a written copy of these instructions to help guide you during your deliberations. But still feel free to take notes on anything you wish to take notes on.

So as I told you at the beginning of the trial, the Defendant is presumed to be innocent of the accusations against him. This presumption of innocence remains with the Defendant unless and until the Government presents evidence satisfying you beyond a reasonable doubt that the Defendant is guilty. The presumption of innocence is sufficient to require a not guilty verdict unless you find that such evidence has been presented.

If you find that the Government has proven the Defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, the presumption of innocence disappears and is of no further avail to him; however, until that time, the presumption remains with the Defendant.

Now, I'm going to shortly explain to you the offenses with which the Defendant is charged and the elements that the Government must prove in order to establish that the Defendant is guilty of those offenses.

In order for the Government to prove the Defendant guilty of an offense, it must convince you

beyond a reasonable doubt that it has proved each and every element of that offense. Possibilities or even probabilities are not sufficient.

If the Government fails to prove any one or more elements of the offense beyond a reasonable doubt, you must find the Defendant not guilty of that particular offense.

On the other hand, if you are convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that all elements of the offense with which the Defendant has been charged have been proven, then you should find the Defendant guilty of that offense.

Bear in mind that the requirement that the Government prove every element of the offense with which the Defendant is charged does not mean that the Government is required to prove every statement contained in the indictment. What it means is that the Government must prove facts sufficient to prove all of the elements of the offense with which the Defendant is charged as I explain them.

Now, as I have said, the burden is upon the Government to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the Defendant is guilty of the charges made against him. It is a strict and heavy burden, but it does not mean that the Defendant's guilt must be proved beyond all

possible doubt. It does require that the evidence exclude any reasonable doubt concerning the Defendant's guilt.

Now, a reasonable doubt may arise not only from the evidence produced but also from the lack of evidence. Reasonable doubt exists when, after weighing and considering all of the evidence, using reason and common sense, jurors cannot say that they have a settled conviction of the truth of a charge. Of course, a defendant is never to be convicted on suspicion or conjecture. If, for example, you view the evidence in the case as reasonably permitting either of two conclusions, one that the Defendant is guilty as charged and the other that the Defendant is not guilty, then you will find the Defendant not guilty.

It is not sufficient for the Government to establish a probability, even though a strong one, that a fact charged is more likely to be true than not true. That is not enough to meet the burden of proof beyond a reasonable doubt.

On the other hand, there are very few things in this world that we know with absolute certainty, and in a criminal case the law does not require proof that overcomes every possible doubt.

So in concluding my instruction on the burden of

proof then, I'm instructing you that what the Government must do in order to meet its heavy burden is to establish the truth of each part of the offenses charged by proof that convinces you and leaves you with no reasonable doubt and thus satisfies you that you can consistently with your oath as jurors base your verdict upon it.

Now, if you so find as to the charges against the Defendant, then you'll return a verdict of guilty on those charges. If on the other hand you think there is reasonable doubt about whether the Defendant is guilty of the offense, then you must give the Defendant the benefit of that doubt and find the Defendant not guilty of that offense.

You're going to have in the jury room with you the indictment in order to remember the precise charges against the Defendant. I'm going to remind you once again that the indictment is nothing more than an accusation. It should not be considered as evidence of guilt. It may not even be the basis of an inference of guilt. All that it does is bring this matter before you for a determination, and beyond that it has no significance whatsoever. It merely sets forth the elements of the offenses which the Government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt.

Now, you will note that the indictment charges that the offenses in this case were committed in or about a certain date. The proof need not establish with certainty the exact date of the alleged offenses. It is sufficient if the evidence in the case establishes beyond a reasonable doubt that the offenses were committed on a date that is reasonably near the date alleged.

The indictment in the case charges the Defendant, Gerald J. Silva, with seven counts.

Counts I through VI charge the Defendant with receipt of child pornography, that Defendant knowingly received child pornography. Count VII charges the Defendant with possession of child pornography, that is, that the Defendant knowingly possessed child pornography.

As I have told you each of these offenses has essential elements. To find the Defendant guilty of an offense, you must find that the Government has proven each of the essential elements of that offense beyond a reasonable doubt.

I'm going to explain the elements of each offense and specific definitions in a little more detail in a moment.

Now, keep in mind as you consider the charges

against the Defendant that a separate offense is charged in each of the counts of the indictment. Each offense, and the evidence which applies to it, should be considered separately by you and you should return separate verdicts as to each count. And you will have with you a verdict form, and I'll talk about that in a moment, which gives you each count separately.

So first let me address the specific elements of Counts I through VI, that is the counts of receipt of child pornography.

Counts I through VI of the indictment charge the Defendant with receipt of child pornography. It is a federal crime for anyone to receive child pornography that has been mailed or moved in interstate or foreign commerce. Title 18 of the United States Code, Section 2252(a)(2) provides in relevant part: Any person who knowingly receives any visual depiction using any means or facility of interstate or foreign commerce if such visual depiction involves the use of a minor engaging in sexually explicit conduct shall be guilty of an offense.

In order for the Defendant to be found guilty of receiving child pornography, the Government must prove each of the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt: First, that the Defendant knowingly received a

visual depiction by mail or in interstate commerce or foreign commerce by any means; second, such visual depiction involved the use of a minor engaging in sexually explicit conduct; third, the Defendant knew that such visual depiction was of sexually explicit conduct; fourth, the Defendant knew that at least one of the persons engaged in sexually explicit conduct under such visual depiction was a minor.

Now I am going to instruct you as to the specific meaning of some of the words and phrases that I've been using in these instructions. In these instructions, the word "knowingly" means that an act was done voluntarily and intentionally and not because of mistake or accident. You may consider evidence of the Defendant's words, acts or omissions along with all other evidence in deciding whether the Defendant acted knowingly.

The offenses of receipt of child pornography charged in Counts I through VI and possession of child pornography charged in Count VII require that the Government prove that the Defendant acted with knowledge. This means that the Government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the Defendant was conscious and aware of the nature of his actions, and that the surrounding facts and circumstances as

specified in the elements of those offenses as I have outlined them and that he did not act because of ignorance, mistake or accident.

In deciding whether the Defendant acted with knowledge, you may consider evidence about what he said, what he did and what he failed to do, how he acted and all the other facts and circumstances shown by the evidence that may prove what was in the Defendant's mind at that time.

It is for you, the jury, to decide whether the material received and possessed by the Defendant meets the definition of sexually explicit conduct. If the Defendant incorrectly believed what does and does not constitute child pornography, that does not relieve him of responsibility as long as the Government has proven the elements that I've outlined above.

Now, to receive something simply means knowingly to accept or to take possession of something. The term "visual depiction" includes data stored on a disk such as a DVD which is capable of conversion into a visual image.

The term "interstate and foreign commerce" is the movement of property between different states or between the United States and a place outside of the United States. The term "minor" means any person under

the age of 18 years.

Now, the term "sexually explicit conduct" as that term is used in Counts I through VII of the indictment includes any one of the five categories of conduct, whether actual or simulated, including the lascivious exhibition of the genitals of any person.

As I told you at the beginning of the case, this case does not involve Categories 1 through 4, which I listed for you at the beginning of the case and I don't need to repeat now. This case involves Category 5, the lascivious exhibition of the genitals of any person.

Now, nudity alone is not enough to make an image child pornography. The law requires lascivious exhibition of the genitals. Whether an image of the genitals constitutes a lascivious exhibition requires a consideration of the overall content of the material.

In considering the overall content of the image, you may but you are not required to consider the following factors: First, whether the genitals are the focal point of the image; second, whether the setting of the image is sexually suggestive, for example, a location that is generally associated with sexual activity; third, whether the child is depicted in an unnatural pose or inappropriate attire, considering the age of the child; fourth, whether the child is fully or

partially clothed or nude; fifth, whether the image suggests sexual coyness or a willingness to engage in sexual activity; sixth, whether the image appears intended or designed to illicit a sexual response in the viewer.

An image need not involve all of these factors to constitute lascivious exhibition. It is for you to decide what weight or lack of weight to be given to any of the factors that I just listed. You may conclude that they are not applicable given the facts of this case and this list of factors is not intended to be comprehensive, and you may consider other factors specific to this case from the evidence that was presented at trial and that you find to be relevant.

Now, Count VII regards the possession of child pornography. Title 18 of the United States Code, Section 2252(a)(4)(B) makes it a federal crime for any person to knowingly possess any material that contains a visual depiction that has been shipped or transported in interstate or foreign commerce by any means if the production of such visual depiction involved the use of a minor engaging in sexually explicit conduct and the visual depiction is of such conduct.

To find the Defendant guilty of Count VII, the Government must prove the following elements beyond a

reasonable doubt: First, that the Defendant knowingly possessed any materials that the Defendant knew contained a visual depiction of a minor engaged in sexually explicit conduct; second, the Defendant knew the visual depiction contained in the materials showed a minor engaged in sexually explicit conduct; third, the Defendant knew that production of such visual depiction involved use of a minor engaging in sexually explicit conduct; and fourth, that the visual depiction had been either, A, mailed, shipped or transported in interstate commerce, or B, produced using material that it had been mailed, shipped or transported in interstate or foreign commerce.

The Government is not required to prove that each of the previously stated elements has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt as to each and every image or video that was introduced into evidence. The Government is only required to make this showing with respect to one image or video.

Now, I've already instructed you on the meaning of a number of different terms in connection with Counts I through VI, and those definitions are also applicable to Count VII. Those terms are "knowingly," "visual depiction," "interstate and foreign commerce," "a minor" and "sexually explicit conduct." Those terms

have the same meaning as applied to Count VII as they do to Counts I through VI as I just said.

I'm now going to instruct you on the meaning of the term "possession." For purposes of this case, "to possess" or "possession" means to exercise authority, dominion or control over something.

Now, although you have heard evidence that the Defendant had multiple images or videos of -- just one moment.

Counsel, come up.

(Sidebar conference.)

THE COURT: I think I need to add the words "Of the Government charges is child pornography" because that sounds like I'm stating it is child pornography.

MR. DONNELLY: That's fine, Judge.

MR. MANN: Thank you.

MR. DONNELLY: Thank you.

(End of sidebar conference.)

THE COURT: Let me begin that last instruction again.

Although you have heard evidence that the Defendant had multiple images or videos of what the Government charges is child pornography as I've defined that for you in these instructions, the Government is not required to prove that all of the images in

evidence constitute child pornography. Rather, the Government will have proved what is necessary for a finding of guilty if it proves beyond a reasonable doubt that the Defendant acted as charged with respect to any one depiction of child pornography so long as you, the jury, agree unanimously as to which depiction or depictions meet the required elements.

Therefore, as long as you find beyond a reasonable doubt that the Defendant knowingly acted with respect to at least one image or video and that the other elements of the offense have been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, you may find the Defendant guilty.

So now that you know what it is that the Government must prove and what the standard of proof is to be applied, the next question is how do you determine whether the Government has proved these things beyond a reasonable doubt.

Obviously, you must make the determination solely from the evidence that is before you, and from all reasonable and legitimate inferences to be drawn from that evidence. The evidence that's properly before you consists of the testimony of witnesses, the exhibits that I have admitted into evidence and any stipulations, although I believe there have not been

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

any stipulations in this case. So it is the testimony of witnesses and the exhibits that have been admitted into evidence.

Now, from the evidence you may draw whatever conclusions are reasonable under the circumstances. The evidence that is before you does not include the following: Comments and statements by attorneys, answers given by witnesses which I ordered stricken and ordered you to disregard, documents or other photographs or other items which may have been referred to but have not been admitted into evidence. Since they are not proper evidence, you should not speculate or guess as to what they may say or show, and you may not consider them except to the extent that and for purposes that they may have been read or shown to you during the course of the trial. And finally, anything you may have seen or heard outside this courtroom about the events in question or the participants in this case are not evidence.

Now, you were permitted to take notes during the course of the trial; however, you should remember that not everything you write down is necessarily exactly what was said and that your notes are not evidence.

Thus, when you return to the jury room to discuss this case, do not assume simply because something appears in

somebody's notes that it necessarily took place in Court. Instead, it is your collective recollection and memory that must control as you deliberate upon a verdict.

Now, you have heard evidence that the Defendant made statements in which the Government claims that he admitted certain facts. It is for you to decide, first, whether the Defendant actually made the statement; and second, if so, how much weight to give the statement.

In making those decisions, you should consider all of the evidence about the statement including the circumstances under which it may have been made and any facts or circumstances tending to corroborate or contradict the version of events described in the statement.

As to the testimony of witnesses, your principal task is to determine the credibility of the witness or witnesses and the weight that you will give to the testimony of each. In making that determination, there are a number of factors that you may consider. One, the opportunity or lack of opportunity for the witness to acquire the knowledge of the facts about which the witness testified. In other words, was the witness in a position to have accurately perceived the facts that

the witness related to you.

Second, the reliability or unreliability of the witness's memory. In other words, did the witness have a clear recollection of what happened or was the witness's memory cloudy or uncertain or unclear.

Third, the witness's appearance on the stand.

Did the witness appear to be a person who was telling the complete and unadulterated truth, or did it appear that the witness was slanting things one way or another, consciously or unconsciously.

Fourth, the probability or improbability of the witness's testimony. Did what the witness had to say sound reasonable or plausible, or did it appear to be highly unlikely or implausible.

And fifth, whether the witness had anything to gain or lose from the outcome of this case. In other words, was the witness totally impartial, or did the witness have some stake in the outcome or some reason to favor one side or the other.

Now, in evaluating the testimonial evidence, remember that you are not required to believe something to be a fact simply because a witness has stated it to be a fact and no one has contradicted what the witness said.

If in the light of all the evidence you believe

the witness is mistaken or testified falsely or that he or she is proposing something that is inherently impossible or unworthy of belief, then you may disregard that witness's testimony even in the absence of any contradictory evidence.

You should also bear in mind that it is not the number of witnesses testifying on either side of a particular issue that determines where the weight of the evidence lies, rather it's the quality of the witness's testimony that counts.

Thus, just because one witness testifies on one side of an issue and another witness testifies on another side does not necessarily mean that you must consider the evidence to be evenly balanced. If you feel that one of the witnesses was more credible than another for whatever reason, you may find that the weight of the evidence lies on the side of the first witness.

Similarly, just because there may be more witnesses testifying on one side of an issue than on another does not mean the weight of evidence lies in the favor of the greater number of witness. Once again, it is the credibility or the quality of the testimony that determines where the weight of the evidence lies.

Now, the fact that a witness may have been employed by a law enforcement agency does not by itself mean that you should give that witness's testimony any greater or any lesser weight simply because of that fact. You should assess the credibility and testimony of such witnesses by applying the same factors as you would with respect to any other witness.

Also, the mere fact that this case is brought in the name of the United States of America does not entitle the prosecution in the case to any greater consideration than that accorded to the Defendant. By the same token, it does not mean that the prosecution is entitled to any less consideration. All parties, whether Government or individuals, stand as equals before the Bar of justice.

Now, in addition to assessing credibility, the credibility of witnesses and the weight to be given to their testimony, you should also evaluate the exhibits, which you will have with you in the jury room. You can examine them and consider them carefully; however, bear in mind that merely because an exhibit has been admitted into evidence does not mean that you're required to accept it at face value. Like the testimony of a witness, the significance of an exhibit or the weight you attach to it will depends on the

evaluation of that exhibit in light of all the facts and the circumstances of the case.

Now, certain videos that may have been of a disturbing nature have been admitted into evidence. You may feel that these are not pleasant images to look at. You should not let these images affect your emotions to the prejudice of the Defendant. Your verdict must be based on a rational and fair consideration of all the evidence and not on passion or prejudice against the Defendant, the Government, or anyone else that is connected with this case.

Now, as I mentioned to you earlier, you may consider only the evidence that's properly before you; however, that does not mean that in determining the facts you are limited to the statements of the witnesses or the contents of the exhibits. In reaching your conclusions, you are permitted to draw from the facts that you find have been proved such reasonable inferences that seem justified in light of your experience, inferences or deductions or conclusions that reason and common sense lead you to draw from the facts that have been established by the evidence in the case. Such evidence, as you recall, is sometimes called circumstantial evidence. To put it another way, the facts that may be proved either by direct -- a fact

may be proved by either direct evidence or circumstantial evidence. Direct evidence you'll recall includes such things as the testimony of an eyewitness who personally observed the fact in question or a photograph or a document of the actual thing that is described. Circumstantial evidence consists of a proof of a series of facts or circumstances from which the existence or non-existence of another fact may be reasonably inferred. Now, the law makes no distinction between the weight to be given to direct and circumstantial evidence; however, it does require that any fact required to convict the Defendant be proved beyond a reasonable doubt.

Now, although the Government is required to prove the Defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, the Government is not required to present all possible evidence related to the case or to produce all possible witnesses who might have some knowledge about the facts of the case. As I said to you many times, it is up to you to determine what the facts of the case are. You should not interpret anything that I have said or done during the course of this trial as expressing an opinion on my part as to what the facts of the case are. I have not intended to express any such opinion to you, and you should not be concerned about what my

opinions are regarding the facts of the case. That is a matter for you alone to decide.

Now, neither bias in favor of any person or any cause or prejudice against any person or cause nor sympathy of any kind should be permitted to influence you during the course of your deliberations. All that any party here is expected or entitled to expect from you is a verdict that is based on your fair, scrupulous and conscientious examination of the evidence that is before you and your application of the law as I have explained it to you.

Now, in order to return a verdict in this case, all 12 of you must agree as to what that verdict will be. You cannot return a verdict of either guilty or not guilty against the Defendant unless your decision is unanimous. Therefore, there are two things that you should keep in mind during the course of your deliberations. On one hand, you should listen carefully as to what your fellow jurors have to say, and you should be open-minded enough to change your opinion if you become convinced that you were incorrect.

On the other hand, you must recognize that each of you has an individual responsibility to vote for the verdict that you believe is the correct one based on

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the evidence that has been presented and the law as I have explained it. Accordingly, you should have the courage to stick to your opinion even though some or all of the other jurors may disagree with you, as long as you have listened to their views with an open mind.

Now, when you begin your deliberations, you should elect one member of the body to serve as your foreperson. The foreperson will preside over your deliberations and will speak for you here in court. You will then discuss the case with your fellow jurors and reach an agreement if you can do so. Your verdict must be unanimous. Each of you must decide the case for yourself, but you should do so only after you've considered all the evidence, discussed it fully with the other jurors and listened to the views of your fellow jurors. Do not be afraid to change your opinion during the course of the deliberations if the discussion persuades you that you should, and do not come to any decision just because the other jurors think it is right.

Now, if it becomes necessary for you to communicate during your deliberations with me, you may send a note through the marshal, signed by the foreperson. No member of the jury should ever attempt to contact me except by a signed writing, and I will

communicate with any member of the jury on anything concerning this case only in writing or here in open court.

Now, if any reference that I have made or that counsel has made or makes in their arguments to any matters of evidence, if it does not coincide with your own recollection, it is your recollection which should control during your deliberations.

Now, occasionally jurors want to rehear testimony. I want you to understand that in a relatively short trial like this that generally your collective recollection should be sufficient for you to be able to deliberate effectively. However, if you feel you need to rehear testimony, I'll consider your request. Just keep in mind that this is a time-consuming and somewhat difficult process. So if you think you need this, consider your request carefully and be as specific as possible.

As I mentioned earlier, I prepared a verdict form for you, and you'll have that verdict form with you in the jury room. So after you've reached a unanimous verdict, your foreperson will fill that form out, sign it and date it, and then advise the Court through the marshal that you are ready to return to the courtroom.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20 21

22 23

24

25

And finally, as I told you, I have prepared a copy of these instructions, which I'll be giving to you, to assist in your deliberation.

So that ladies and gentlemen, completes my instructions to you on the law. Mr. Donnelly will now give you closing argument on behalf of the Government followed by Mr. Mann's closing argument and then Mr. Donnelly has the last word with rebuttal argument, if he wishes, because the burden of proof, as you know, rests with the Government.

So Mr. Donnelly, are you ready?

MR. DONNELLY: Yes, I am, your Honor.

Thank you very much.

MR. MANN: Your Honor, are you going to hear us later on issues?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. MANN: Thank you.

MR. DONNELLY: May it please the Court, Mr. Mann, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, good afternoon.

We're not here today because the Defendant possessed and received pictures of boys skinny-dipping on a beach. We're not here today because of mere nudity. We're definitely not here because the Defendant is a nudist. We're here today because, as

Judge Smith just explained to you, it's against the law to receive and to possess child pornography. And as Judge Smith just explained, we're here because it violates those laws just the same way as if you had pictures of sexual intercourse and other forms of sexual activity. It's against the law to receive and possess images that depict the lascivious exhibition of the genitals.

So we're here today because from October of 2010, until April of 2011, on more than 20 occasions, how ever you count it, this Defendant accessed the Internet on countless occasions, and on those 20-plus occasions went to the Azov Films website and made up his mind knowing exactly what he was doing to purchase these images of these naked boys, these lascivious pictures of these young boys.

We know that once he got them, he watched them.

And after watching them, they remained in his

possession up until the day he ran into Inspector

Michael Connelly. That's the date of the execution of

the search warrant, September 27, 2012.

So that led to the indictment you have before you in this case. So first, I'd like to thank you. At the beginning during my opening statement I asked you all if you could just pay close attention to the

evidence. It hasn't been easy for you at times. We recognize that. But you did pay close attention. It's going to help you immeasurably in your deliberations. This isn't a complex case, and I don't think I need to use a lot of your time this afternoon, but if you'll bear with me I'd like to take just a few moments to give you the Government's understanding of the evidence in this case.

Use your common sense. You don't have to leave it at the courthouse door. The Judge told you about the burden of proof in this case. In a free country it should be on the Government. It is. We gladly accept it. But remember what he said, also, that we're a country and a Government of humans and, therefore, we can't know anything beyond all doubt. And so the burden of proof, yes, is on the Government to prove the elements of the offenses beyond a reasonable doubt but not beyond all doubt.

As the Judge instructed you, consider each count. You will have for your assistance -- I think we have it hidden back here, but you'll get Government's Exhibit 32, the big summary chart, you'll have that to help you. The Judge is going to give you a verdict form where the videos that are charged for each count are specified for you.

You will also see in the indictment that dates are charged, and it will say in or about or on or about. You're going to see a table in the indictment for Counts I through VI that tell you what video was charged in this case as well as the approximate date received. The reason in the law is that dates don't have to be exact. You can understand in this case we know when the orders were placed with Azov Films. We know they were put into the United States after being shipped from Canada in international commerce. They were placed into the United States mails but the exact date when the Defendant received any of these is something that we can't know today.

The Judge told you that the Government must prove that the Defendant committed these offenses knowingly. Part of the consideration of that element, the knowledge element, is that the Defendant did not act by accident or mistake.

The Defendant here, folks, as you know, is not being charged with the possession of one video he happened to order. He's not being charged with any of the unopened videos. You heard some testimony from Inspector Connelly and even the Defendant today that around 13 of the videos he ordered were not opened.

None of those are before you as specific videos under

the charges.

But you have to ask yourself now that you know what's in these videos that once you get that first one, don't you stop? Once you get the second one, don't you say, "Oh, they're all the same"? But no, he went on a third, a fourth, a fifth, a sixth time. Knowledge. Knowingly.

Look through Exhibit 28. That's the catalog with the descriptions of each film. You know, they don't come right out and say about some of the lewd scenes we all saw in this case. They hint at it. They tell you how sweet the boys are. And you ask yourself, as I asked you to ask during the opening statement, lascivious or lawful?

You'll remember there was testimony today when you are considering whether there was knowledge in this case, this is the invoice from December 2nd of 2010, remember "Vladik Remembered, Volume 1"? I think we looked at some clips from that particular exhibit. If you buy that on December 2nd, you remember some of the scenes that were in there, why do you go ahead and buy, this is the long list of New Year's Day purchases the Defendant made that also included "Vladik Remembered, Volume 2." If you don't know that these videos contain child pornography, why do you go back to the well

again, and again, and again. It's because he knew, he liked it for whatever reason, and wanted it. That's why we're here today.

One of the elements in this case will be that the materials were put in the U.S. mails. So that's why it seemed meaningless at the time but we put in the envelopes for you. We have to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that these items either came to the Defendant in interstate or foreign commerce, which I think we did as well; that they went from Canada, you recall, to upstate New York outside of Buffalo and then were put in the U.S. mails to the Defendant's house.

Now, the Judge instructed you on the idea of sexually explicit conduct. He explained to you the word, how you use -- some factors you can use to consider the word "lascivious." It's a common sense word, I'd suggest to you. Not a common word. Not one that we all use in everyday speech perhaps, but just what you think it means is what it means, is are these pictures for lewd and lustful purposes. I ask you, what other purposes is there for all these things that he possessed?

As you consider that, though, it's not the intent of the subjects that you should be considering but the intent of those who designed these images. You

might see the boys having fun, smiling. They might not know what's going on around them. They might not know why these things were being produced. But what about the people who designed these images? That's one of the factors the Judge gave you. Are these images designed for a lascivious purpose?

I told you at the beginning of this case that you would -- through the Defendant's actions, you would get a glimpse into the international market in child pornography, how the Azov Films website was serving tens of thousands of customers throughout the world. And we were privileged in this case to hear from some highly-skilled law enforcement professionals from both sides of the border. You'll recall Toronto Police Service Detective Paul Krawczyk, who told you that after doing some preliminary investigation he obtained a search warrant for the Azov Films business premises, going there on September 1st of 2011. You should have a picture of the Azov Films building up on your screens right now. You recall that they went around back and executed the search warrant through that garage door.

What did they find there? They found an entire production studio for these videos. You heard testimony how they received raw footage from the Eastern European countries where these boys were being

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

filmed and how a production studio was set up inside.

Remember there was some testimony about even sound-proofing material was put on the walls, and how after that raw footage was converted into digital films, those digital films were served on the large servers at Azov Films.

You also heard that once those digital copies of the films were on the large servers, large computers, how they had sort of industry grade DVD burners on scene where they could pump out DVD after DVD, which was then put in some slick packaging with artwork on the boxes and textural material describing what's on the boxes and, of course, you get a good overview of the scope of the operation if the testimony did not establish that for you. And you'll remember, lastly, that the bright, young computer investigator from the Toronto Police Service, Matthew Ross, how he testified about how he and his computer team were in charge of trying to figure out to map out where the computers I hope you were impressed with how careful they were with the evidence and how you can be assured that when they made that exact bit-for-bit digital image of the Azov Films server and they passed that on to American investigators that you can rely on the evidence you have in this case. Certainly the

Defendant is not disputing it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But you'll recall from Matthew Ross's testimony how he'd said "I unplugged the Azov Films server from the wall, from the Internet on May 1st of 2011, at approximately 9:00 p.m."

And you heard from Mr. Ross, as well as from Mr. Psyllos, the American postal computer analyst, state that when once a website is disconnected from the Internet and you try to go to it you can try and type it in, they'll be a record of you trying to do that, as Mr. Psyllos found on the Defendant's computer, you'll find a record of it but once you tried to go on the website that you're just going to get an error message. Who cares about that? Well, we care about it because seeing those error messages, and even the Defendant referred to it today, you know something's wrong. Might be something innocent. We've all probably tried to go to websites and we get these error messages that something is down. But that something's wrong, I submit to you, ladies and gentlemen, you can consider whether it went into the Defendant's mind and whether he started thinking, wait a minute, I go to this site all the time and I went a few days ago. It's down. It's down. What's happening here? What went again. should I do about it? I've made all these purchases.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Well, I'd submit to you that fear sets in and might have set in on the Defendant. The reason why I submit that to you is that we know that -- we know it from the e-mail to Ken Bell the Defendant sent where he says, Oh, the website is down. It's gone. We know that at the latest he knew about this on June 3rd. even in the Defendant's testimony he couldn't pinpoint a date, but he seemed to say it was some time earlier than that. And I'd submit to you, ladies and gentlemen, that he knew the website was down. He knew there was a problem. He surmised that law enforcement might have caused the taking down of this website. submit to you that's the state of the evidence and that explains his weird e-mails to Ken Bell where he talks about what an awful website Azov Films is and how they're -- they depict themselves as naturists, a naturist website, but whoa, all the videos they're selling are naked boys. Like that's an awful thing.

He tried to explain it away today, his language in those e-mails. He tried to explain it away today by saying that, Well, what I meant from this is bah, bah, bah, bah, bah, bah. Does that explanation make sense to you? He was trying to get one over on Ken Bell, to tell him and so there would be a record of him telling Ken Bell that this is a bad website that

exploits young boys and that is grooming them for future adult pornographic films.

He might have been right about that, but he was not truthful with you, I would submit, when he tried to testify today that that was not the message he was sending to Ken Bell. The e-mail speaks for itself. Look what he has to say.

Now, after the shutdown of the Azov Films website, as I mentioned, Toronto Police Service passed on the evidence relating to particularly the American customers to Inspector Brian Bone. You heard from Inspector Bone who told you that he then had to cull through the evidence. There were ten thousand plus American customers of Azov Films, and he found the invoices that you have as evidence in this case of the Defendant's purchases and he passed them on to Inspector Connelly. Inspector Connelly told you, that intern, he got the evidence, did some further investigation and obtained a search warrant for the Defendant's home at 34 Morris Street in Coventry.

We know the Defendant lives there alone and, well, I guess these pictures speak for themselves as far as the organization of the belongings in the house. But we know that most of the evidence in this case came from the Defendant's video room. I'd submit to you you

look at the easy chair there with the TV, this

Defendant -- you had to suffer through these movies at quadruple and double and quadruple speed when Mr. Mann played them all for you. I'd submit to you he tried to say he was watching them at fast speed. Use your common sense. He was sitting in that chair enjoying these films and not at quadruple speed.

Azov Films were found during the execution of the search warrant throughout the Defendant's house. We know he had a DVD player, a TV to watch them on. And Inspector Connelly told you about finding the room in this condition and searching through the stuff in there to find the Azov Films that were scattered throughout the room. Hardly, by the way, the organized research project that the Defendant tried to sell you.

The computer the Defendant used to buy these videos was found in the house and -- found in this room, excuse me, the Toshiba laptop that you heard about from Mr. Psyllos.

You know, a word on that. The Defendant told you today about how he doesn't know much about computers and he's not really good with them. You know, you'll have to decide what value this topic and his testimony has for you, but ask yourself this. Is this a guy who doesn't know how to use a computer?

He's accessing somebody else's wi-fi, one of his neighbors, perhaps. He goes down to Starbucks, he goes to Panera Bread or Tim Hortons, or whatever it is, and accesses the Internet that way. Why? Because he's ignorant? No. Because he knows he can get it off somebody else for free, and he doesn't want to pay for it. I'd submit to you he also knows that that would stop the trail, an investigative trail back to his computer.

We already talked about the mailings. Several of those were found in the house.

A word on the child pornography. The Court instructed you about this word "lascivious." And sorry, folks, but I have to just quickly show you a couple of the images that we had in the evidence in this case. But the Judge gave you six factors to consider in this case in determining whether that word "lascivious" has been proven, whether these images are or if they're merely nude pictures. Obviously, this isn't the baby in the bathtub type picture.

First factor, are the genitals the focal point?

Now, maybe on one or two occasions you might have seen scenes where the cameraman focused in on the crotch area of one of these young boys. There wasn't a lot of zooming in. But what you do see, these images I would

submit to you, were just obsessed with these boys' genitals, to make sure that they were always visible and that the boys did things to make them more visible to the leering men who watched these videos.

You remember in the first video we showed you, it's called "FKK Waterlogged." Remember the boys sitting, doing sit-ups on the bed, their genitals right across the middle of the picture. Prior to that, one of the boys still had his underwear on. There was an unmistakable erection in the picture. These images were just obsessed with the genitals of the boys.

Maybe a more helpful factor, the settings. Where did these pictures take place? Were they at the volleyball court at the nudist resort with moms and dads around? Of course not. They were always inside; or if outdoors at private places outside, a beach perhaps, where nobody else is around. There's no adults, there's no moms, there's no dads, there's no family setting. The settings are beds, are mattresses.

In one of the last things you saw, you saw the boy at high speed, Mr. Mann played it, a boy in the blow-up pool putting oil all over his body and spinning around. Why? For somebody else's pleasure.

You saw, as far as other settings, saunas, showers, pools settings. Consider it.

Unnatural poses. You remember the child in the chair, the naked boys in this Lotus position when you ask yourself about the positions these kids were put in. That was from "Vladik Remembered, Volume 1." It's Exhibit 2. We showed you the clip. You saw it again when Mr. Mann played it. The boy sitting in the chair and then he gets upside down, does like a headstand and then he puts his feet together. And the camera then really did zoom in on his genitals and anal area. Lawful or lascivious?

Remember the wrestling scenes you saw in several of the videos. Why is it that the boys' legs always seemed to get wrapped around the other kid's head, crotches near faces. And I'm sorry I have to argue this way, folks.

You know, on two occasions you heard evidence that along with the videos the Defendant bought DVD photo bonus disks. I asked him today why did you buy those. "Oh, they were on sale." Come on. I'd submit to you a good place to start in your deliberations might be those exhibits because go to them and ask yourself is this just mere nudism? Just to run through a few of them, folks, I apologize, but I think it's necessary. Lawful or lascivious?

Why do you need those still images? Why do you

even order them?

One of the other factors, are the children fully clothed or nude and is it a natural thing considering the age of the child. Is this the way that 12, 13, 14-year-olds behave? Mr. Silva would have you believe that in his PowerPoint, the natural state of the child. Do you believe that? Really? Is it a natural state for two or three boys to hop in a shower? Obviously, it's natural for a naked person to hop in a shower but then two or three 12- or 13-year-old boys, is that what they do naturally? And then do they take down a bottle of shampoo, put some in their hands, or soap, and rub it all over the boy in the shower with them? Natural pose? I don't think so.

You'll remember the scene, one of the first scenes we showed you from Exhibit 1, "FKK Waterlogged," where the older boy takes oil and puts it on the back of the younger boy and rubs him up and down his back right down to the top of his buttocks. Lawful or lascivious? There's just no explanation for it, no lawful explanation for it.

Designed, sadly, for men who like this kind of thing. That might be something that's new to you in this case, but I'd submit to you the evidence shows that, sadly, it's a real thing. There are people like

the Defendant out there who like this stuff, who want it and will spend a lot of money on it. This isn't nudism. We all sat through the indoctrination on naturism and nudism. That was on the slides. But as I've said, there's no families here. It's just kids being, in the words of the Defendant, exploited, groomed.

Now, the Defendant testified. It's going to be up to you decide what to do with his testimony. You can consider it against the prior statements and behavior he's engaged in. I would submit to you that his testimony like his statements to Inspector Connelly, like his e-mails to Ken Bell, the PowerPoint he came up with, it's all designed to cover his tracks, all designed to be a smoke cloud to come up with some explanation as to why he took his money and spent it on these things time and again.

And as you consider his testimony, consider who he is. This isn't an uneducated person. He's smart. He's educated in the system. He works with prosecutors, police officers like Ken Bell all the time. He works with child protection people. So this is a person who knows the system.

We know that for most of his career right from getting out of high school he's wanted to be around

young boys.

And so as you consider his testimony, consider his demeanor, how he appeared on the witness stand as the Judge's instruction suggested. And ask yourself did it make sense to you. Did it make sense, his claim that these are all legal and these are just boys being boys.

And you have to ask yourself, maybe a good starting point, is his credibility about his presentation. We know that his PowerPoint wasn't created until after he knew, and we know he knew on June 3rd from that e-mail to Ken Bell and we know that the earliest date he started working on this, the PowerPoint to end all PowerPoints, the presentation to end all presentations, the big one, even though he had never done a presentation before, he didn't start working on it until July 9th of 2011.

He was worried, folks. And you'll have all those slides to go through. Go through them. Ask yourself if they make sense. Ask yourself if those are the work of a person who has had all these years of experience working with sexual offenders. You'll find some statements that are perfectly truthful and common sense from this area. There's nothing scholarly about it. And half of them are just weird, like the natural

state of the child is nude.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You notice that he couldn't tell us at all how the dozens of Azov films that he purchased, opened and watched, how any of them advanced the ball on the preparation of his presentation. So consider that when you evaluate the Defendant's credibility.

He tells you that -- excuse me. One other factor Judge Smith said you could consider is the Defendant's interests or any witness's interests, whether it's Inspector Connelly, the Defendant or anybody, you consider whether they have something to lose or gain in this case. You consider that as you evaluate the Defendant's testimony as well. yourself if he's doing research, and Inspector Connelly testified -- my recollection is that Inspector Connelly testified that the Defendant told him that he was preparing -- he got the wrong idea, Inspector Connelly, "I'm preparing a presentation for work." If that was true, why is he spending \$1,589 of his own personal money, why is he using his own private g-mail address instead of going through the normal processes of his employer.

Well, got to come up with an explanation for that, and he gave you his explanation this morning during his testimony. Well, folks, I'd submit to you

that the Defendant wasn't doing research. He was just pursuing his own sexual gratification. Why didn't he tell Ken Bell? He tells Ken Bell all these things about how awful this website is. They're putting on airs of legitimacy. They're grooming young men to enter into the world of adult porn. He tells Ken Bell all this stuff and never tells his good friend that he purchased dozens of these videos? Never tells him that he spent 1500 bucks on this website? See, he didn't tell Ken Bell the truth, and I'd submit to you he didn't tell you the truth today. He's covering his tracks.

So as you consider this case, I'd submit to you he's covering his tracks and it shows something to you. It's called a consciousness of guilt.

This case isn't complicated, folks. The Defendant was collecting child pornography, the kind he obviously liked. When he got caught, came up -- when Azov got caught and when he got caught, he came up with false explanations. This shows that consciousness of guilt. And I'd submit to you that that's the one thing you should agree with him about, his guilt.

So I thank you for your attention, and I'd ask you to find this Defendant guilty of all the counts of the indictment. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Donnelly.

Mr. Mann.

MR. MANN: Your Honor, ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Donnelly and Mr. Silva, Mr. Connelly, this is my opportunity to make a presentation to you on behalf of Mr. Silva. Like Mr. Donnelly, I want to thank you for sitting through this trial. All of us who do trials are appreciative of what jurors go through and we're grateful to you for participating in the system.

In a moment, I'll get into the evidence and all that, but make no mistake about it, there's an overarching issue in this case. Are these images lascivious or not? I think you were told at the beginning of the trial by the Court that that was going to be the issue. It is the issue. There are some side issues that I'll get into. Mr. Donnelly got into them, but the issue is are these images lascivious. And I guess I part company with the Government right at the beginning. Not only am I going to argue that they're not lascivious, but I'm going to ask you to look at these images not necessarily from your own perspective but from the perspective of someone who is a nudist because that is one of the issues in this case.

Many of you may have found these images unacceptable, distasteful, inappropriate. Many of you

may have even found them repulsive, but that's not the question before you. The question before you is: Are they lascivious? Mr. Silva is a nudist. He told you he was. There's no real dispute he's a nudist.

Mr. Donnelly doesn't say he made that up. That wasn't an excuse that he made up to cover his tracks. He clearly was a nudist. And I would suggest to you that these films are nudist films. They may be at some level in-your-face nudist films. Most of us when we have something thrown in our face don't like it. Even if we agree with it, we don't like it. If we disagree with it, we like it even less I would suggest to you.

You have to get over all that, I would argue to you, and ultimately look at these films and say to yourself at some level are they lascivious. And we'll go through the guidance the Court gave you as to what constitutes lascivious and what it isn't but more what it is. And also the fact that the Court said you can consider other factors, and I'm going to suggest to you some other factors. And also that you need to consider these materials in context.

Before I get there, though, I want to touch base, first, with a fundamental point that animates this case. It's a criminal case, and it's different than other types of decision-making that most of you

have probably gone through in your life. Most of the situations where you had to make a decision, you get a body of information and you decide what's more likely than not. Your kid comes home late. You ask your kid, "Where have you been?" The kid gives you an excuse or an explanation. You decide is it likely true or likely not true. And that's the way we make decisions day in and day out in life.

This is a criminal case where you make a decision in a different way. You make a decision based on whether the Government has proven its case beyond a reasonable doubt. I hope that at the end of this case you will be persuaded -- I hope that you'll be persuaded that these films were not lascivious, that they were not lascivious, that they were not lascivious, that they were nudist films. And I hope that when we go through the factors you'll come to that conclusion, but it is not Mr. Silva's burden to convince you that these films are not lascivious. It's the Government's burden to prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt that they are lascivious. It's not his burden to prove to you that they're not. It's the Government's burden to prove that they are.

So if you're in a position of equipoise, so to speak, and if -- if there's a robust debate about whether they're lascivious or not lascivious, then I

would submit to you the Government has failed in its burden of proof. I'm hopeful that when we get done with this you'll be persuaded that these are nudist films, not lascivious films, but I want to emphasize that it's not Mr. Silva's burden.

What I now want to do is go through some of the witnesses in the case to see what they contribute to the assessment of this case, but let's be frank, we can go through all the witnesses but at the end of the day the first step in this analysis is going to be the DVDs. You're going to have to think about what's on those DVDs, what's on those tapes.

The first witness the Government presented was Sergeant Krawczyk. He told you that there was an arrest in Toronto. He told us that Azov had lots and lots of customers but, miraculously, he didn't know; and Mr. Ross, the computer constable from Toronto didn't know; and Mr. Bone, the U.S. expert didn't know how many visitors there were to the website at all. We know there were lots. We know there were lots because we know there were over 10,000 customers.

I think Mr. Krawczyk told us also that they had been selling in 90 countries. He said that they'd been in existence for five or six years and they operated as any other website, like an Amazon.

Well, then at some point either with him or Mr. Ross there was the discussion about, well, they're not quite like every other website because they block certain people from gaining access like law enforcement agencies. But the person who said that also acknowledged that there's no way a normal visitor to the website would ever know that.

This was, from all appearances, an above-board legitimate website that operated, as Sergeant Krawczyk said, like Amazon. It wasn't one of these things where you used a fake name. It wasn't a peer-to-peer network sharing like Napster or Livewire or one of those things. This was a website that was operating from all appearances just like any other public website. You used a credit card, and I think they said it functioned like Amazon.

Mr. Ross, the computer constable from Toronto, really didn't tell us much more than what we've already talked about with respect to what's relevant to this case although there were pretty pictures of all the computers and the servers and the burners that they had in Toronto. And that proves that it was a big deal in Toronto, but in a lot of ways what that does is it goes again to prove that this, from all appearances, was a legitimate operation.

Mr. Bone, the postal inspector who was in charge of this case in the United States, told us there were over 10,000 U.S. customers. He didn't know what "FKK" meant. And he verified and he told us basically when he looked at the invoices, I think he was the first one who looked at these invoices, that Mr. Silva had used his own name and all that sort of stuff. By the way, the reason we asked about FKK, if you look at the history of nudism that's on many of these videos, I don't think it's on all of them, it's on many of these videos, you'll see that in one of those videos they describe that "FKK" stands for a German word that is related to nudism in German, and they have a definition of it there.

What Mr. Bone begins to do is he says, Look, you know, we had these invoices and they identified Gerald Silva. How? Because he used his name and he used his address. That's how.

One of the sort of tensions in this case is that the Government says, Oh, Mr. Silva made up this whole thing about the PowerPoint, did all this stuff to cover his tracks. In one of the arguments I wants to make to you throughout this case is Mr. Silva did everything completely above-board. He used his name. He used his address. He used his regular e-mail. He could not

have been more above-board about what he was doing.

And if he ever thought for a single second that what he was doing was getting child porn, I submit to you, he wouldn't have gone about doing it this way, by going on a public website where he had to know there would be a record of what he did, where he used his own name, his own address, his own e-mail, his own telephone number.

I thought Mr. Donnelly hinted at the fact that he was using wi-fi because it wouldn't give his Internet address. I would suggest to you it doesn't matter whether you give your Internet address or not. What he gave was all the identifying information about himself from start to finish. This was a man who has been in the field, depending upon how you count it, 30 or 40 years depending on whether you count the Boy Scout time or not. Not quite that, but at the time of the arrest maybe 28 to 38 years.

He's in the field and the Government wants you to believe that he knowingly picks up child pornography not once, not twice, but makes 22 orders using his own name. I would submit to you that that is inherently absurd that he would do it so much out in the open, particularly somebody who has been in law enforcement by that point for seven or eight years.

What else does Mr. Bone tell us? Mr. Bone in a

lot of ways confirms -- many of the Government witnesses in a lot of ways confirm Mr. Silva's point of view because they confirm that he's telling the truth. They confirm that he used his own name. They confirmed that he used his own identity. That's what they do. They don't prove anything to the contrary at all.

Mr. Psyllos was the local computer person. He told us that Mr. Silva had access to the Azov site or tried to access the Azov site for a couple of years, but he didn't know how often. He told us about the PowerPoint document. He told us that it had been created on four different dates, and he explained the creation date was just the date on which it first appears in that directory. But pretty much Mr. Silva confirmed for you in his testimony today that, yes, it probably was the summer of 2010, I think it was, when he first created that and that was because that's when he got the PowerPoint.

Now, the next witness I think was Mr. Connelly.

I'll come back to him a second.

They then called Christine Imbriglio, the
Department of Corrections employee. And I guess she
was called to prove that it was a rouse that Mr. Silva
was creating this PowerPoint, that it was all
make-believe because he never got permission from the

Department of Corrections. But I would say to you, you'll have the Department of Corrections policies there, but more important you'll have her testimony. And the thrust of her testimony was, I think, and it's my recollection, you'll have to sort of assess it on your own, two things. One was that if it didn't deal with the Department of Corrections, you didn't need permission; and two, if you're going to make a presentation, you have to give them ten days notice. So we were nowhere in a position where even if Mr. Silva was going to do it as a DOC employee that he had to give them notice.

Then the Government called Ken Bell. You know, look, both sides cull out of the evidence what we can. And the Government takes a look at the Ken Bell e-mails and says, Look at this long e-mail, look at the doubts Mr. Silva expressed about the Azov website. He did express doubts. He was concerned about what was happening. He explained to you why he was concerned about what was happening. Even Ken Bell didn't know by May 11th or 12th when he got those e-mails, and maybe even by later in June when he got the final e-mail, that the Azov website had been shut down.

But what the Government doesn't focus on is there's an e-mail back from Ken Bell after the first

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

e-mail where Mr. Silva says, "Give me your address; I wants to make sure I'm sending this to the right person, where Mr. Bell says to Mr. Silva, "You guys could probably teach the course," because there's also a little colloguy in there about going to a seminar. And what does that tell you? It tells you a couple of It gives you an insight as to how Ken Bell views Mr. Silva. It gives you an idea that he has a positive view of him. It gives you an idea that Mr. Bell sees Mr. Silva is experienced in this field, knows what he's talking about, and it completely buttresses the whole point I would like to make to you that it's absurd to think Mr. Silva would go ahead and buy child porn in his own name, make 22 purchases knowing all that he knows. It just doesn't make any sense, I would submit to you.

And the notion that he then creates this whole artificial world to explain this away is even more fantastical, I would suggest to you.

The Government's view appears to be that the e-mails to Ken Bell and the PowerPoint were all a rouse to create an explanation for his possession of the Azov tapes. First of all, none of that explains why when he does all this he uses his own name.

The Government says, Oh, he didn't tell Mr. Bell

about his purchasing the Azov tapes. Why would he contact Mr. Bell at all if he thought -- and bring his name into the picture if he thought he was doing something wrong with the Azov tapes?

There's another point I would just make, and I'll sort of try and anticipate the Government's response. The Government says, well, by this point, by the time he sends the e-mail to Ken Bell, he knows that Azov's been arrested, that they've executed the warrant and that he knows he's on notice then and he's just trying to cover his tracks. The Government's point also is that while he's trying to cover his tracks, he keeps all this Azov material and he keeps it probably for I think about a year-and-a-half or so under the Government's theory after he supposedly knows it's child porn.

Now, the Government is going to come back and say, well, he knew that he couldn't erase the computer records, the fact that he ordered these things. No, he couldn't. That's absolutely true, but that goes back to the first question, why would he ever, why would Gerald Silva, a probation officer in the sex offender unit, ever order something that he thought was child pornography using his own name, sending it to his own address. It just makes no sense at all.

And you know that he knows a fair amount about this not just because he's given you some insight into who he is by his own testimony, but because Ken Bell in the e-mail back -- this is where we're talking about which parts of these e-mails do we emphasize -- Ken Bell says, "You and Heidi could probably teach the course," Heidi being his work partner.

I want to talk a little bit about Mr. Connelly's testimony. Mr. Connelly talked about what happened when he went to the house and he effectuated the arrest and all, but let's talk about some of the other things he also talked about.

First, there's no dispute really about the vast majority of what happened when they got to the house. Mr. Connelly says Mr. Silva gave him a bunch of information. Mr. Silva says I gave Mr. Connelly a bunch of the information. Not only did I give him the information about buying from Azov, I gave him access to my account. I signed the form that they could have access to my e-mail account. I told them about the presentation. I told him about the Ken Bell letters.

Everybody seems to agree on both sides that Mr. Silva was totally candid with Mr. Connelly about all this stuff. There are some differences in recollection, apparently, about what happened at these

meetings, but I would submit to you at the end of the day they basically say, we came there, we asked him questions, he answered our questions and he told us everything he had done, including the fact that he was a nudist, too.

What else does Mr. Connelly tell us? He talks about the difference between child pornography and erotica, and he said both dealt with sex and all that but that child erotica was a little bit different. He talked about whether there was a plot or a story line and these things. He talked about how the pictures were formed, things like that.

Then he said to us -- and let me back up for a second. The Government has to prove to you that these films constitute a lascivious exhibition of the genitals. It's not enough for them to prove to you that, at least if you accept Mr. Connelly's definition, that they were child erotica. It's not enough to prove that they were offensive. It's not enough to prove that they were disturbing to you. It's that they were whatever the term "lascivious" means, and you've got these guideposts that we're going to come to in a few minutes.

Mr. Connelly said there was no plot in the Azov films, but there was a story line in a lot of the Azov

films. There were story lines about following the actors. They're not different than I would submit than travel logs or anything else, except that people were nude here.

What's different about these pictures is that the boys were nude. And we have to overcome, if we're going to look at this objectively, I would submit to you, a couple of things. For probably many, many people, maybe not all of us, but for many, many people, we're not used to seeing people nude. It's just not the way it is in this country. It might be different in some places, but we're not used to it.

The second thing we ought to be upfront about, and I would implore you to put aside when you get to deliberations is we're not used to seeing nude boys. And it would be pretending that there's -- it would be ignoring a pink elephant in the room to not say that there's a problem with homophobia in our society.

All I can ask of you is to put all that aside when you try and make an assessment about whether or not these films are nudist films generated out of Eastern Europe or whether they're lascivious.

Most of the films you can see just about all of the boys. Now, obviously if you're seeing the front of the boy, you can't see the back; and if you're seeing

the back of the boy, you can't see the front, but these are not films where all you see is a woman's breasts or a boy's genitals. You see the whole boy in virtually all of the picture. When you see them on the bed doing sit-ups, you see all of the boy. You see the boys' faces in virtually every depiction unless their back happened to be turned to you. I would suggest to you that that is very different than what you would expect if you were looking at just lascivious films.

Mr. Connelly acknowledged, I don't think there's any dispute, there's no sexual intercourse in these films, but it's more than that, I would suggest to you. There's just no sex in these films. There are boys playing around naked.

One other comment I'd like to just mention briefly that Mr. Connelly made, I asked him if he had an opinion about two films. One was "Pool Buddies," I think the other was "Mountain Men." He said he had seen them briefly, but he'd have to review them in more detail to have an opinion as whether they were erotica or pornography. You can't tell just from looking at the cover of these films what they are, I would suggest to you.

The final witness, of course, was Mr. Silva. I know you just heard him this morning and I don't intend

to spend a lot of time on his testimony, but I do want to make certain points to you about his testimony.

Maybe the biggest point is the Government says, oh, he's making this all up. There's his video room. He liked to sit there and relax and watch videos.

Since he was 18 years old, and he's 59 now, he has done some of the tough work in our community. He has worked with the Boy Scouts. He worked at Camp Eckert or the Eckert Foundation. It was Camp E Huntee. He worked at Kent County Mental Health. He works at Gateway, and then he works as a probation officer with sex offenders, working with some of the most difficult populations that we have in this state. He dedicates his life to that and has almost 40 years of service working with that population right now. Never once before this event has he been charged with anything or convicted of anything. He tells you that and it's uncontradicted in the record.

He has a reason for looking at these materials. He tells you that he wants to leave a legacy. He's putting in an enormous amount of time.

On the one hand on the one level -- he probably doesn't want me to say this. At one level, it doesn't matters why he had these material. On one level, it just matters were they or were they not lascivious, and

I would suggest to you that they were not lascivious and I'll go into the reasons in just a second.

But look at who he is and it does apply to the question of what type of knowledge he had. Look at who this person is, look at what he's done over 40 years. It's sort of remarkable, I would suggest to you, that when you work with that field that somebody hasn't said something about you before this. He's never been charged, much less convicted, of anything else. He's had a stellar record of working with the toughest people our society can produce.

And now, the Government comes in and says here's some films. There's no sex in the films -- you know, when I say there's no sex, not only is there no sexual intercourse, there's no masturbation in the films, there's no oral sex, there's nothing except nudity I would suggest to you.

So when you think about Mr. Silva, think about what he's done and think about whether it makes any sense that this man suddenly when he's 57, or something like that, decides to go off the deep end and start ordering in his own name child pornography and turn everything he's built and done for the last 35 or close to 40 years upside down.

I want to talk about the exhibits briefly. The

postal packing, there's no dispute that it was mailed in interstate commerce and that it was mailed to Mr. Silva. The Miranda rights form and the consent to search online, they just established that Mr. Silva cooperated from the beginning and didn't conceal anything from the Government. They support his decision. They don't contradict it.

The receipts from Azov that were introduced in evidence that we've gone through, they verify, again, that he didn't conceal his identity. He signed the date that he was arrested. It wasn't even a matter of thinking about what's best for me. He signed them, he acknowledged them without any debate.

The pictures of his home, yeah, it doesn't look like "Home Beautiful." It also was clear that he wasn't concealing anything, I would submit to you. Surely nobody is suggesting he be convicted because his home was a little messy.

The pictures of the search in Toronto just had no bearing, I would submit, on whether Mr. Silva is guilty of anything.

The e-mails, they just again establish that Mr. Silva used his own identity. The screen shots of the catalogs, if you look at those screen shots, and you've got them in evidence that tell you what's

supposed to be in these videos give you more of a picture than what the Government would lead you to believe. Some of these kids played again and again. There were followings of these people. It wasn't a "War and Peace" trilogy or a novel, but there was a story and there was some people followed particular actors.

The DOC policies, I submit, the Department of Corrections policies support more than undermine Mr. Silva's position. The chart that the Government introduces basically connects which DVDs go to which allegations.

The notion that this PowerPoint is invalid because Mr. Silva didn't tell people about it and sort of the implication was he had to tell the people at the Department of Corrections I would suggest is undercut by the DOC policy and Ms. Imbriglio's own testimony. Even beyond that, he had no obligation to tell anybody what he was working on. So he's working on it. There's no doubt that he had been working on it for a while, and you can take a look at the slides. They obviously took a lot of work to produce.

So now I want to turn to what I think is sort of the critical issue in this case. I'm going to move a little bit because I have a couple of notes that I'd

like to put up for you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The issue is were the images lascivious. Isn't that really the heart of this case? I apologize for moving back here, but I hope that putting a little bit up here you can follow my argument a little bit with respect to this.

First, you have to consider the overall content of the material. You'll see that in the instructions. The Court identified six factors which can be considered. The Court didn't say these were the exclusive factors, but they said these are six factors that you could consider. The first one was: genitals the focal point of the image? Now, obviously, this is my shorthand way of trying to argue this. is I would say to you there were no zoom shots of the There just weren't. In fact, there were genitals. some zoom shots of faces occasionally, but they didn't zoom in just on the genitals. You could see the genitals in most of the pictures but they didn't zoom in on the genitals. You almost always saw the whole Usually the face was visible. So the notion that -- you didn't see hours and hours of just the genitals. What you saw was video showing pictures of these kids and, yeah, the genitals were visible, but it wasn't just zooming in on the genitals.

Now, another fact the Court said you could consider was is the situation -- is the setting sexually suggestive. Not only is there no sex, actual sex, there are no sex toys, there are no condoms, there's no dim lighting.

The demeanor of the boys. When you look at these videos, and I submit you can't get it out of just looking at a single shot, almost uniformly the demeanor of the boys in these videos was playful, laughing, smiling. It was what you would expect out of young boys. And if they had clothes on, you wouldn't think a thing of these videos. You would think they were just videos of kids horsing around, whether it's in the shower, in a pool, on the beach or on a train trip. What makes everybody who is not used to nudism pause is that these boys didn't have clothes on. But otherwise, these films would be remarkably unremarkable to create a bad phrase. I mean, they were just normal films, I would suggest you.

And when you look at how these boys were reacting, maybe they could have coached the boys for a scene or two. But look at the totality of these films, and what you see is the boys consistently laughing and smiling. And that's the opposite of a sexually suggestive scene. Even the scenes where the boys were

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

on the bed or in the train bunks, in the bunks on the train I would suggest you see boys horsing around. You don't see them sort of snuggling together in a train bunk or something like that. You see them fooling around, playing in a bunk on a train. You see them playing on the bed, but you don't see sex. You do see a massage maybe a few different times, but I would suggest to you Mr. Donnelly says the massage went right down to the bottom of the boy's back, not just about to the buttocks line. Well, that's right. The massage didn't go to sexual area. That's the whole point. The massage was not sexual. Not every massage is sexual. A massage certainly could be sexual but the massages that you saw were not. They were not of the genitalia. They were not sexual. You didn't see him rubbing the buttocks, you didn't see him rubbing the genitals. You saw a massage of the back. Surely we can't say that every massage of the back becomes a sexual event.

The food scenes, the word I used was silly. I think there are other ways you could describe the food scenes including gross and sort of at a certain age you may think food fights are beyond silly, they're disgusting and why do them. But whatever they are, I would argue, they are not sexual. How anybody could infer sex from that food scene I would suggest to you

is a real stretch. It just wasn't about sex.

Those were two of the factors that we've talked about.

The Court also said you could consider whether the child was in an unnatural pose or inappropriate attire. None of these were posed shots. I mean, we've all seen posed shots, mostly with adults. The "Sports Illustrated" shots, we know what a posed shot is for sexual purposes. You don't even have to go to that. You can go to all the ads that Calvin Klein runs, or I think Mr. Connelly mentioned the Speedo bathing suits. We know what a posed shot is. You didn't see posed shots there. You didn't see boys modeling their genitals, closing their genitals, things like that.

Inappropriate attire. You can make something more sexual by putting these boys in things like tight Speedo trunks and trying to highlight their genitalia. It's your recollection that controls, but certain many of the boys when they were in bathing suits had regular bathing suits on and some had apparently smaller bathing suits on. What I would suggest to you is that what you did not see was posed shots. You saw the kids playing around and, as I said to you, I think if you saw these kids with clothes on you would think nothing of it.

You look at another criteria that the Court mentioned was, was the child fully or partially clothed or nude. Well, clearly the boys in this case were nude, but also clearly nudity is not enough. You need something more than mere nudity to establish lasciviousness. I think you'll see that in the instructions; you heard that in the instructions.

These are nudist films. Of course the boys would be nude. It would be sort of like contradictory if the boys weren't nude. Of course they're going to be nude. They're nudist films.

Now, some of you might say to yourself, I object to nudist films, but that's not the issue. You have an absolute right to say I don't like nudist films, I don't ever want to see nudist films. I don't like the nudism movement. You have that total right. But you don't have the right to convict Mr. Silva because he received or possessed nudist films.

Another factor is whether or not the images suggest sexual coyness or a willingness to engage in sexual activity. And there again, I would suggest that what you saw was the boys playing. You didn't see anything suggesting sexual coyness or a willingness to engage in sexual activity. There just wasn't anything like that, I would suggest.

Then finally, whether the image appears intended to elicit a sexual response in the viewer. I would suggest that the better view of these movies, these videos is that they're nudist not that they're designed to elicit a sexual response. There was nothing in these movies except the nudity that would be a basis for inferring sexuality. There were so many more things that could have been done. We've all seen ads, we've all seen movies where with or without nudity there's a suggestion of sex, and that wasn't what you had in these cases. I think what you had was 12-year-old, 8-year-old, 16-year-old boys playing around.

Now, those are six factors the Court identified.

The Court also said there are other factors that you could consider. I want to suggest to you what some of those other factors are.

First, there are no scenes of adults having contact with the kids. There's no sex between these boys and anybody, much less any situation where you've got adults using these kids for sexual purposes. You don't see these boys and adults massaging each other or anything like that. Adults just aren't in these film. You see youths playing with youths.

The vast majority of this footage was

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

group-oriented. There wasn't a romantic scene. And when there wasn't a group, you had a boy with a chicken, for example. I would say to you that whatever it was, it wasn't sex.

The videos all seemed to come from Eastern

Europe, and I would encourage you, you'll have as

exhibits the cases in which these videos came in. Take

a look at these cases. They'll give you more, I

submit, of an understanding or a feel of the fact that

these were nudist videos.

There was clearly some sound but not at a higher The point that I wanted to bring to your attention, the nudity didn't appear to be an issue with the boys. Remember how the boys acted among themselves. Mr. Donnelly talked about the shower Think about the scenes where the boys are scene. dressing or undressing. The boys don't focus on each other's genitalia. They don't seem awkward about that. They seem to be horsing around, but you don't see them staring at each other's genitalia. You don't see them staring at each other when they're dressing or undressing. You see them doing things in the shower and throwing water on each other while in the shower. No different, I would submit, that probably happens in locker rooms in high schools and colleges all around

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the country. But you didn't see any focus just on the genitalia there. What I would suggest to you is what these films depict is European nudism.

And the last video that we saw, you remember we had a problem with one of the videos and it ended up being the last one we saw. You saw the interviews of the boys. Not all boys, but three boys gave interviews. You saw subtitles. Think about those interviews. Those interviews, I would submit to you, shed more light on what was going on. These kids who were enjoying themselves, nobody could coach those kids in that maybe in saying the words but not in the acting and appearing the way they did. This doesn't reflect the exploitation of children in these films, I would suggest to you, and interviews of boys having a good time, talking about what movie they were seeing, things like that.

The movies did have both an introduction about the legality of the movies and some of the movies had this history of nudism. I think those are factors that you can consider, I would urge you to consider. That's how these movies were being marketed, not as child porn but as part of nudism. And look at that history of nudism if some of you have questions. It's not terribly long. We went through it once, but it talks

about the whole history of nudism mostly in Europe and the United States, mentions of India, I think, and a few other places. But I would submit to you that it is instructive for us.

The way these films were marketed, they were marketed through the Web in a very above-board fashion. It's not like you had to go to a dreary bookstore, not like you had to use some file sharing network like Napster or LimeWire to access these things. You got them like any other product you would get on the Internet.

I would argue to you that if there were a single word to describe these films it would not be "sexual." It would be "boring." And in the end, Mr. Connelly said that one of the factors that you could consider was the end goal of the user. One of the pieces -- and I think the Court told you that you can consider the evidence that's been produced or not been produced. I asked Mr. Silva if he'd ever used these films for sexual pleasure. He denied it. Not only did he deny it, you've no evidence of that. There's not a single clip suggesting -- of him doing anything sexual or with respect to these films. There's not a single clip or anything suggesting that Mr. Silva in any way was using these films for a sexual purpose.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

What the Government has is a lot of videos of nude boys, but that gets back to the fact, I would submit to you, that it's just nudity and nothing more.

Now, I ask you to look -- I'm sure you listened closely to the Judge's instructions. Look at them, you'll have them there, about the Government's requirement to prove knowledge. The Government has an obligation not only to prove that these materials were lascivious, and I submit to you that they haven't. submit to you they can't. But they also have to prove that Mr. Silva knowingly received them. One argument I've already made is it's just absurd to think that Mr. Silva given his background would now suddenly at age 57 or so, after a career of commitment, go into child pornography. And if he did do that, to suggest that he would do it in his own name and his own home --I mean Boy Scouts from 18 to 28; Eckert from about 28 to 35; Kent County Mental Health Center from about 35 to 40: Gateway from about 40 to 49, and since that time a probation officer. And you can be sure that at each of those jobs when he moved around, somebody checked him, somebody vetted him, somebody looked into his background, and somebody had wanted to know was this somebody appropriate we could hire to work with kids or finally when we get to the Department of Corrections

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that could work with the Department of Corrections.

And each time he gets hired by somebody new to work with a difficult population. And now all of a sudden he changes stripes at age 57?

It's also just absurd, I would suggest to you -first I would suggest to you it's absurd to think that he would change stripes at age 57. There's just no basis for it. There's nothing else, you have nothing in this record to suggest that he's involved with child pornography except his possession of a bunch of nudist videos. You don't have him acting out on these videos. You don't have videos of him doing anything. You don't have any evidence of his contact with any kids. You don't have anything at all except the Government going into his house based not on something that he did here, but based on the fact that they got a list of people who were customers and that he was one of over 10,000 customers in this country on the website. And then based on that list they go into his house and they seize a bunch of films that are nudist films. they're nudist films. That's what they are, I would suggest to you. Take a look at these criteria.

That's the argument I would make on his behalf.

But even if you think the worst of him and you think

somehow or another he has gone over to the other side

or something, it's just absurd to think that somebody who is in law enforcement who is supervising people who are sex offenders is then going to start to go into the child pornography field in such an above-board way using every bit of his own identity, his own house, his own name, his own e-mail, everything.

Finally, of course, the Government has to prove -- they have to prove, in any event, that these images were lascivious. And for all the reasons I've just tried to go through with you, I would submit to you that they are not lascivious.

I've talked to you a little bit about the fact that Mr. Silva is a nudist, that these came out of a nudist community. I would argue to you that what you really saw was nudist films. Now, there's all this back and forth about why did Mr. Silva create this PowerPoint, why did he send a letter to Ken Bell, all that sort of stuff. Look at the PowerPoint, ladies and gentlemen. It took some real work to do that. It's not a finished product. Mr. Silva testified to you clearly that he expected it to be much more. But it seems like an awfully strange way to make up an explanation for why you possess child pornography to make a whole PowerPoint that references the Azov stuff.

When you look at the PowerPoint, particularly if

you look at the notes on the PowerPoint but also some of the slides, you'll see references to Azov Films.

I would submit to you that that PowerPoint is exactly what Mr. Silva told you it is, it's the beginning of his effort to leave a legacy. But beyond all that, beyond all that, the question is always has the Government proven beyond a reasonable doubt that these films are lascivious. The lascivious issue governs each of the seven counts. In other words, there's no difference in the definition of "lasciviousness." It applies equally to all the counts. If you find that these videos were not lascivious, then Mr. Silva is simply not guilty.

I just want to respond briefly to a few of the comments that Mr. Donnelly made. He talked about the video of the three boys in the shower. I would suggest to you that what's remarkable about that -- not remarkable but when you look at that shot, what you see is three boys in the shower. You don't see them focusing on each other's genitalia. You see them horsing around in a shower. As I said to you, I would submit to you that that's what takes place in boys locker rooms. There wasn't even any towel snapping or anything like that. It was just playing around with the shower and aiming the water. And even that wasn't

focused on the genitalia. That's what these films were. They were not focused on the genitalia.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

There was a reference to Mr. Silva's interest in the case. Of course he has an interest in the case. He spent 37 or 38 of the years of his life, now almost 40 dedicated to helping, as I said, in working with the most difficult people in our community. And it would be naive to say he doesn't have an interest in the case. But what I would submit to you is also take into account his background, take into account who he is when you assess did he knowingly receive and possess child pornography.

In the end, you really have to just look at the DVDs. You have to think about whether Mr. Silva had knowledge, but you basically have to look at the DVDs, and I challenge you to find more than nudity in the DVDs. What there is, is nudity and a lot of nudity. If I have offended people by playing these videos yesterday, or whenever it was, I think it was yesterday or the day before yesterday, I apologize. You'll have the videos back there. If you want to look at more of them, you can. The point is you have to look at these things in an overall content sort of way. And when you look at these, simply looking at a two-minute snippet, I would suggest to you, is not enough. If you look at

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

these videos as a whole, what you see is hours and hours of video and no sex. Simply no sex. Just lots and lots of nudity. That's what you see. And there has to be more than mere nudity. You don't see intercourse. You don't see masturbation. You don't see rubbing in the genitalia. You don't see oral sex. You don't see any sex at all in these movies. All you see, I submit to you, is nudity. And I hope that persuades you that these films are not lascivious.

But finally I would say to you even if you are not persuaded that these films are not lascivious, at least I submit to you the Government has failed to prove to you that they are lascivious. And if you're not sure they they're lascivious, whether you like these films or not, whether you like what Mr. Silva did or not, whether you agree with his lifestyle or not, if you're not sure -- and look. Look at his lifestyle. We can stereotype all we want, but we can't convict everybody of possession of child pornography because of their work with Boy Scouts or because they're a man working with young men. That's the stereotype that you cannot fall into. He shouldn't be punished for spending a lifetime working with young people. should at least be recognized for the contribution he gave when you're getting to making the assessment of

reasonable doubt. And if in the end, even if we haven't persuaded you that these movies are not lascivious, I would urge you that the Government surely hasn't persuaded you that they are. And if they haven't persuaded you that they are, and if you're not sure, that you've got some doubt about whether they're lascivious or not, then you have to acquit. And for that I'm asking you to acquit him of all charges. Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Mann.

Mr. Donnelly, do you have any rebuttal argument?
MR. DONNELLY: A few minutes, your Honor.

Folks, just a few minutes of your time just to try to address some of the points Mr. Mann just made.

He went through on the ELMO some of the factors he wants you to think about. When you have time to deliberate on this case and you'll have the Judge's instructions, there are those six factors, the first six factors you're not required to find any of those if you don't want to. There's certainly no minimum. Certainly not all six of them need to be agreed upon by you. They're just guides to help you determine whether you agree or not that these pictures are lascivious.

And Mr. Mann pointed out a lot of things that we don't dispute. You can say a million times, well,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

there's no sex, there's no sex, there's no sex. Well, Congress made it illegal to possess pictures, yes, of graphic sex, but also of the lascivious exhibition of the genitals.

So we go around in a big circle but we're back at the question and you have to ask yourself as you consider that, again, sorry if this is new for many of you, but there are certainly normal sexual desires out there and there's abnormal sexual desires out there. And I think here you're seeing abnormal sexual desire, and you have to see these pictures in light of that, not in light of what those boys think. I told you in my opening argument that those boys, they might be genuinely thinking they're having fun. Who knows? Skinny Eastern European kids, who knows where their heads are at? Who knows what road they've come down to get in front of those cameras for whoever is taking those pictures? We don't know. But what we do know is that you can look at those pictures and see that they're intended and designed to please somebody. don't buy those videos because they give you information about this or that. You buy them because you like them. That's why you buy several dozen of them, because you're hooked on them.

I suggested to you in my opening argument, go to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Exhibit 5A. You know what you can do? You can also go to the other photo disk he bought, Exhibit 7A. That's the one with the chicken and the cupcakes. And ask yourself, he bought the video, ha-ha, is that boys will be boys having fun? And that's why I'm sorry we showed you that particular clip with the boy sitting on the chicken, you know. And whatever weird sexual thought is going on in the makers of these films, I submit to you that that's what's going on in those pictures. Look at the rest of them. Look how they're cropped and framed. Why do you buy those? Why do you keep those? Is this a normal website operating like Amazon? have looked a little bit like it. Took your credit card just like Amazon does. Why is a normal website blocking law enforcement from accessing it? Look at the products they advertise on there. Boy Joy porno site. Normal website or lascivious website?

The Defendant's presentation, I think Mr. Mann, I don't know if I heard it right or he slipped, said his presentation began being created in 2010. July 9th, 2011, creation date of the earliest PowerPoint.

And he put in an enormous amount of time, 30 years of experience went into this PowerPoint. Come on. You've used PowerPoint. Probably many of you have. If you've used it, he got 33 slides. You'll

have them. Thirty-three by the time that Inspector Connelly runs into him, gets his laptop pursuant to the search warrant and Mr. Psyllos finds those PowerPoints. There's 33 slides. Enormous work? There's no research. There's no citation to authority. There's no citation to psychologists and workers in the field. No citations to the National Centers for Missing and Exploited Children. Nothing. It's like a free-form, free-thinking thing you could do in an afternoon. He did it because the website had been shut down and an explanation had to be made.

Now, did he behave against his own self-interest holding onto those videos? I can't explain that to you. He certainly didn't explain it to us. We do know though that -- and I ask you again to go back to Government's Exhibit 30, the e-mail to Ken Bell. Read it carefully and say to yourself, okay. I've got a guy over here buying dozens of these Azov films, opening them up and watching them. Ask yourself, is that the same guy that's in this e-mail? Spend a few minutes on it. The answer is no. Completely different guy. The guy in the e-mail is false. The guy behind and enjoying the videos, that's the guy behind this case.

Mr. Mann put in his factors, the disclaimers, the history of nudism. Do you think it makes it legal

٠.

if you put a little sign up at the beginning of your child porn video that, well, folks, the United States Supreme Court and Canadian Supreme Court looked at this and bah, bah, bah, bah, bah, all been found perfectly above-board. Do you think that makes a difference? It makes a difference to you. You decide. Why do you put that there? It's just cover, more cover.

You heard Inspector Bone and Detective Krawczyk from Canada say they're not aware of any U.S. and Canadian Supreme Court decisions. I think that strikes your common sense. There's no Supreme Court decisions out there saying this stuff is legal.

THE COURT: Let's wind it up.

MR. DONNELLY: Thank you, your Honor.

One last point, and I can't ignore it. Mr. Mann raised it. He said the pink elephant in the room, we can't ignore it, is homophobia. There's no pink elephant in this room. The Government could care less about the sexual orientation of anybody. It's about pedophilia, sexual pleasure by looking at naked children in different settings and in different ways.

Return a verdict of guilty. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Donnelly.

Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, you've heard my instructions, you've heard the attorneys' closing

arguments. It's now time for you to go to the jury room and to deliberate on the case.

The first thing I'm going to do is swear the marshal before we send you into the jury room.

(Marshal sworn.)

THE COURT: All right. And also at this time, ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to dismiss our two alternate jurors. I do want to thank you for your service. Alternate jurors are the unsung heros of trial. You go through the entire trial but then you don't get to deliberate. I'm sorry about that, but you provide an enormous service simply by being here at the ready at any time there is the need, and often there is. So I'm going to let you two go at this time. Thank you for your service. Hopefully you've acquired somebody's phone number or something to find out when the jury reaches a verdict what that verdict is. Of course, if you don't, you can all call the Court and they'll let you know. All right? So Charlie will give you directions. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

(Alternates dismissed.)

THE COURT: Okay, ladies and gentlemen, Charlie is going to show you to the jury room. In a few moments, the exhibits will be brought into the room as well as my written instructions and the verdict form.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Just get settled and Charlie will tell you in just a moment that you can start deliberating. I just need to do one thing with the attorneys before you actually start. All right?

Charlie, would you show the jury into the jury room.

(Proceedings out of the presence of the jury as follows:)

THE COURT: Mr. Mann, if you could quickly reiterate your objections. You don't need to restate your arguments.

MR. MANN: I'll just incorporate all my prior arguments. On page 12 of the instructions, you gave an instruction that says: "It is for you, the jury, to decide whether the material received" -- I'm sorry, Judge. I may have the wrong page. "It is for you, the jury, to decide whether the material received or possessed by the Defendant meets the definition of sexually explicit conduct. If the Defendant incorrectly believed what does and does not constitute child pornography, that does not relieve him of the responsibility as long as the Government has proven the elements I outlined above."

I'll incorporate my prior arguments, note briefly that I believe it's a comment on the

Defendant's testimony and also diminishes the Government's burden with respect to proving knowledge.

I also object, Judge, on page 27 of your instructions you told the jury that in paragraph five of the instruction on witness credibility, "whether the witness had anything to gain or lose from the outcome of this case. In other words, was the witness totally impartial or did the witness have some stake in the outcome or some reason to favor one side or the other." I object to that as highlighting the Defendant's testimony, as being a comment on the Defendant's testimony, and I would submit that that violates the instructions of the <u>United States versus Dwyer</u>, 843 Fed 2d, 60 and would just incorporate my prior arguments.

THE COURT: All right. Are there any other objections to any of the instructions?

MR. MANN: Only those two, Judge. And all of those were argued previously.

THE COURT: Yes. Okay.

Charlie, you may tell the jury to begin deliberations.

Any objections to the verdict form?

MR. DONNELLY: No, your Honor.

MR. MANN: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Any objection to the instructions

1 being sent in to the jury? MR. DONNELLY: No. your Honor. 2 3 MR. MANN: Not to them being sent in, no. THE COURT: Charlie, the verdict form and the 4 5 instructions. The exhibits will be in momentarily. 6 MR. MANN: May I just ask, your Honor, your 7 Honor caught a --8 THE COURT: I made the change. It's typewritten 9 in and I've substituted the page. 10 MR. MANN: Thank you. THE COURT: So now if counsel could come forward 11 12 and review the exhibits. 13 (Recess taken at 4:10 p.m.) 14 THE COURT: We're on the record. I understand the jury has reached a verdict. Charlie, if you could 15 16 show the jury in. 17 (Proceedings in the presence of the jury as 18 follows:) 19 THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, I understand 20 you reached a verdict. Juror Number 9, I understand 21 you were the foreperson? 22 THE JUROR: Yes. 23 THE COURT: Please stand and hand the verdict to 24 the marshal. 25 Ms. German, could you just stand up for a

Is this a unanimous verdict of the jury? moment. Yes, it is.

THE COURT: You could sit down.

THE JUROR:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I am now going to pronounce the verdict and publish the jury's verdict to the courtroom.

In the matter of the United States versus Gerald Silva, as to Count I of the indictment, receipt of child pornography, with respect to product ID Number 70246, "BF v2.0 FKK Waterlogged," we, the jury, find the Defendant guilty.

As to Count II of the indictment, receipt of child pornography with respect to product ID Number 70127, "Vladik Remembered, Volume 1," we, the jury, find the Defendant guilty.

As to Count III of the indictment, receipt of child pornography with respect to product ID Number 70132, "Vladik Remembered, Volume 2," we, the jury, find the Defendant guilty.

As to Count IV of the indictment, receipt of child pornography with respect to product ID 70248, "BF v2.0, Paul and Calin's Home Video, Bucharest; and BF v2.0 Paul and Calin's Home Video Photo DVD, "we, the jury, find the Defendant guilty.

As to Count V of the indictment, receipt of child pornography with respect to product ID 70249,

```
"Cutting Room Floor, Vlaviu;" and "Cutting Room Floor,
 1
      Vlaviu, Photo DVD," we, the jury, find the Defendant
 2
 3
      guilty.
 4
              As to Count VI of the indictment, receipt of
 5
       child pornography with respect to product ID 70296,
       "Raw Rewind, Volume 2," two disks, we the jury find the
 6
 7
       Defendant quilty.
 8
              And as to Count VII of the indictment,
9
       possession of child pornography with respect to product
10
       ID Number 70188, "FKK Ranch, Party Games," and product
11
       ID number 70194, "Scenes from Crimea, Volume 1," we,
12
       the jury, find the Defendant guilty.
13
              Now, do you wish to have the jury polled?
14
              MR. MANN: Yes, please.
15
              THE COURT:
                         All right. I'm now going to poll
16
      the jury.
17
              Juror Number 1, is this your verdict?
18
              THE JUROR:
                          Yes.
19
              THE COURT:
                         Juror Number 2, is this your
20
      verdict?
21
              THE JUROR:
                          Yes.
22
              THE COURT:
                          Juror Number 3, is this your
23
      verdict?
24
              THE JUROR:
                          Yes.
25
              THE COURT: Juror Number 4, is this your
```

```
verdict?
 1
              THE JUROR:
                          Yes.
 2
 3
              THE COURT: Juror Number 5, is this your
 4
      verdict?
 5
              THE JUROR:
                          Yes.
              THE COURT: Juror Number 6, is this your
 6
 7
      verdict?
              THE JUROR:
                          Yes.
 8
              THE COURT: Juror Number 7, is this your
9
10
      verdict?
11
              THE JUROR:
                          Yes.
12
              THE COURT:
                         Juror Number 8, is this your
13
      verdict?
              THE JUROR:
14
                          Yes.
              THE COURT: Juror Number 9, is this your
15
16
      verdict?
17
              THE JUROR:
                          Yes.
              THE COURT: Juror Number 10, is this your
18
19
      verdict?
20
              THE JUROR:
                          Yes.
21
              THE COURT: Juror Number 11, is this your
22
      verdict?
              THE JUROR:
23
                         Yes.
24
              THE COURT: Juror Number 12, is this your
      verdict?
25
```

THE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

The clerk will file the verdict form.

All right. Mr. Silva, I'm going to set sentencing down in this matter for Friday, May 16th, 2014, at 9:30 a.m.

In the meantime, the Office of Probation will be preparing a Presentence Investigation Report that I will use for purposes of sentencing. I want to encourage you to cooperate fully with the probation officer in the preparation of that report so that I may have all the information that I need in order to conduct sentencing in this matter.

All right. State your positions with respect to remand of the Defendant.

MR. DONNELLY: Yes, your Honor. As the Court knows, there's a presumption that a defendant being convicted by a jury of a serious felony like this should be remanded, detained. In this particular case, the Government acknowledges the Defendant has been out on bail pending these proceedings, but because of the potential sentence that he is facing, perhaps a serious period of incarceration, the Government believes that that would create an unreasonable risk of flight with this particular Defendant. The Government is also

concerned about the Defendant's, for lack of a better term, mental state that this verdict might cause on him; and based even on his testimony here today about his state of mind, the Government believes that it's a concern that everybody will remain safe if he's remanded. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Mann?

MR. MANN: I object. He's been on bail for a long period of time. There's been no incident of misbehavior or anything like that while he's been on bail. He's got strong ties to the community. He owns a home here, and his brother is here. I think a second brother is here, too. He's got no record whatsoever, Judge. There's nothing at all to indicate either a danger to himself or to others based on the period of time that he's been released. I would urge the Court to continue him on the same release. Pretrial services will monitor him, obviously. They keep close tabs on him. It just seems to me it's counter-intuitive that he would go off and do something now, Judge. He's been aware of what was going on for a long time.

THE COURT: All right. These are difficult and close calls, Mr. Silva. I have consulted with your probation officer. He said you've been compliant with

conditions of pretrial release; however, you are facing a long sentence and I know you know that. I am going to order that you be detained pending sentencing.

Mr. Mann knows that he will have the ability to file a motion to reconsider that and I'll consider that motion; but for all the reasons stated by the Government, I think the better decision is to order you to be detained pending sentencing so I'm going to ask the marshal to do that.

Ladies and gentlemen, your work here is completed so I'm going to dismiss you at this time. I am going to ask that Charlie show you back into the

Ladies and gentlemen, your work here is completed so I'm going to dismiss you at this time. I am going to ask that Charlie show you back into the jury room for a moment. I just want to come in and personally thank you for your service now that the trial is over. We'll have you on your way home very shortly.

Charlie, will you show them into the jury room.

(Jurors dismissed.)

THE COURT: So ladies and gentlemen, we'll be in recess.

(Court concluded at 5:15 p.m.)

<u>CERTIFICATION</u>

I, Anne M. Clayton, RPR, certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the transcript originally filed with the clerk on September 16, 2014, and incorporating redactions of personal identifiers in accordance with the Judicial Conference policy.

Redacted characters appear as a black box in the transcript.

/s/ Anne M. Clayton

----Anne M. Clayton, RPR

September 16, 2014

Date